Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-122
Tuesday
25 June 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-122 *25 June 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev To Meet Kohl 5 July, Bush 17 July *[Moscow TV]* 1
Foreign Ministry on CSCE, Other Issues 1
Roundup on Briefing *[TASS]* 1
Deryabin on CSCE *[TASS]* 1
Churkin on Kuwaiti 'Deviations' *[TASS]* 2
Gorbachev Greets Socialist International *[TASS]* 2
Roundtable Discusses CSCE, Security, Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Shishlin Views 'Superpower' Status Issue *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 6
Fears of Western Economic Intentions Eyed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 8
Concern at WEU Intelligence, Military Role *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Jun]* 10
CIA Link of Lockerbie to Libya 'Debatable' *[TASS]* 12
Officials Mark Customs Council Membership *[TASS]* 12
EBRD Plan for Soviet IMF Membership Viewed *[TASS]* 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh on Conversation With Baker *[INTERFAX]* 14

Northeast Asia

Report on Inspection of DPRK Facilities *[Moscow International]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Settlement 'Standstill' Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 15
Cambodian Road to Settlement Remains 'Bumpy' *[Moscow International]* 16
PRAVDA Closes Southeast Asian Office *[20 Jun]* 17

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Progress on RSA Reforms *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 17
Nelson Mandela Visit to USSR Planned *[INTERFAX]* 17

East Europe

New Soviet East Europe Strategy Discussed 18
Background Discussed *Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 7 Jun* 18
Strategy Paper Excerpted *Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 7 Jun* 19
Comment on Strategy *Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 7 Jun 91* 20
Commentary on Anticommunism in East Europe *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun]* 21

West Europe

Finnish President Koivisto Visits Moscow 22
Arrives at Airport *[Helsinki Radio]* 22
Meets Gorbachev in Kremlin *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 23
Further on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 24
Gorbachev 24 June Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 24

Bessmertnykh, Counterpart Discuss Cooperation *[TASS]* 26
Ministers Meet *[Moscow TV]* 26
Lukyanov Meets With Koivisto *[TASS]* 26
Dwindling Finnish Cooperation *[INTERFAX]* 27
Gorbachev Message on War Anniversary *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 27
Ceremonies in Germany Honor Soviet Dead *[Moscow TV]* 28
Armies Could Set 'Example of Cooperation' *[Berlin ADN]* 28
Germany's Kohl Favors Economic Aid to USSR *[TASS]* 28
Bessmertnykh on European Security, Baltics *[Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 23 Jun]* 29
EC Chairman Delors Has Talks With Pavlov *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 30
Delors Meets Cabinet of Ministers *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

Defect Claims in Cuban Nuclear Plant Rejected *[Moscow International]* 31
Shenin Rebuts Charge of Cuban 'Calculation' *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 32
TASS Cites Castro Interview With NBC 32
Salinas Offers Mexico's Reform Experience *[TASS]* 33
Economic Talks With Chile Begin *[Santiago Radio]* 33

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Soyuz Deputies Oppose Draft Union Treaty *[TASS]* 35
Predict Pavlov's Downfall *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Deputies Criticize Privatization Bill *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Supreme Soviet Debates Privatization *[Moscow Radio]* 36
USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 24 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 37
Preamble to Privatization Law Adopted *[Moscow TV]* 39
Resolution Issued on Economic Situation, Budget *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 39

Political & Social

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Military Councils *[TASS]* 40
Gorbachev Dismisses Attacks on Policy *[INTERFAX]* 40
Commentator Views Gorbachev-Pavlov Dispute *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 21 Jun]* 41
Yakovlev Actions Compared to AIDS Infection *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jun]* 42
Yavlinskiy News Conference on Economic Reform *[ROSSISKAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 46
MVD, OMON Take Over Moscow Airport Security *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 46
MVD Troops End Training Exercise in Siberia *[Moscow International]* 47
Papers Menaced by Rising Production Costs *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* 47
Journalists Protest Mail Delivery Charge Increase *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 49
TASS Reviews 25 Jun Soviet Central Press 49

Economic

Cabinet Approves Trade With Comecon, Others *[INTERFAX]* 50
Leningrad Defense Conversion Conference Held *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 50
Conference on Developing Enterprise To Be Held *[INTERFAX]* 50
Plant's Furniture-Making Hits Supply Problem *[Moscow TV]* 50
Refrigerator Plant Inaugurated in Mari ASSR *[Moscow TV]* 51
Poll Shows Business Tempered by Uncertainties *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jun]* 51
Workers' Efficiency Earns High Living Standards *[Moscow TV]* 52

Agricultural

Orel Declares Harvest-Related State of Emergency *[Moscow Radio]* 52
RSFSR Land Reform Newspaper Appears *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Jun]* 52
Central Chernozem Regional Association Founded *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Jun]* 52

Scientific

Space Walk To Replace Damaged Antenna Planned *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Cosmonauts Begin Work *[TASS]* 53
Experimental Girder Installed *[TASS]* 53
Antenna Replacement Complete *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Philosophical, Economic Science Forum Held *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 53

Military

Fighter Sales to Israel Not Soviet Policy *[TASS]* 54
YAK-141 Discussed; Designer Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 54
Committee Chief Sharin on Military Reform Laws *[Moscow TV]* 55
Baltic Commander on Security Lapse at Arms Dump *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun]* 56
Yazov Revisits Army Command School, Recalls War *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jun]* 57
Military Official Stresses WWII Lessons *[TASS]* 57
Volkogonov Criticizes Soviet History of WWII *[INTERFAX]* 57
Volkogonov's Dismissal Viewed *[INTERFAX]* 57
Veterans Issue Urge Support for Government *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jun]* 58
Shlyaga Addresses Eastern MD Political Chiefs *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jun]* 58
Surkov Visits Far Eastern Military Units *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 59
Moiseyev Welcomes McDonalds to Garrisons *[TASS]* 59

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia's Interior Minister Discusses OMON *[BALTFAX]* 60
Estonian Ministers View OMON, Wage Issues *[Tallinn Radio]* 60
Estonian Approach to Citizenship Deplored *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 60
Latvian Minister Comments on Moscow Talks *[Riga Radio]* 61
Latvian Law on Language Issued *[Riga Radio]* 62
Latvian Production Slump Reported *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 62
Landsbergis Meets With French Leaders *[BALTFAX]* 62
Lithuanian Prime Minister on Economic Reform *[Radio Vilnius]* 63

RSFSR

Yeltsin Meets Finnish President Koivisto 25 Jun 63
Direct Cooperation Discussed *[TASS]* 63
Meeting Generates 'Great' Interest *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Yeltsin Signs Free Economic Zone Directive *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 64
Leningrad's Sobchak Challenges Media Appointment *[TASS]* 64
To Discuss Food Issues *[Radio Rossii]* 64
Popov Proposes Moscow Administrative Changes *[TASS]* 65
Moscow City Administrative Reforms Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Chechen-Ingush Republic Congress Opens 21 Jun *[TASS]* 65
Gorbachev Addresses Delegates *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 65
Congress Ends *[TASS]* 66
Deputies Alarmed at Moves Against Gorbachev *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 22 Jun]* 66
Siberian Communists Criticize Soviet Leadership *[TASS]* 67
Siberian Secretaries Urge Congress of Communists *[Moscow TV]* 67
Tatarstan To Independently Sign Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 67
RSFSR Diplomats To Be Posted in Soviet Embassies *[INTERFAX]* 67
Silayev Views Denationalization, Privatization *[Radio Rossii]* 67
Licensing of RSFSR Commodity Exchanges Begins *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Jun]* 68

Western Republics

Belorussia Votes For Republican President *[Radio Rossii]* 68
Ukraine's Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty *[TASS]* 69

Moscow Television Reports Kiev Rukh Rally 69
Rally Denounces Union Treaty *[Kiev Radio]* 69
Ukraine Strike Committee Holds Founding Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 70
Youth Paper Profiles Ukrainian Nationalists *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 70

Caucasus

Armenia's Manukyan Raises Confidence Question *[TASS]* 73
Early Referendum Urged *[INTERFAX]* 73
Armenian Supreme Soviet Acts on Presidium *[Yerevan Radio]* 73
Armenian President on Secession From USSR *[Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ 23 Jun]* 74
Armenian Communists Favor Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 75

Central Asia

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev on Union Treaty Issues *[TASS]* 75
Kazakhstan Parliament Discusses Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 75
Uzbek President Congratulates Yeltsin *[Moscow Radio]* 75

Gorbachev To Meet Kohl 5 July, Bush 17 July

LD2406213991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 24 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The main items of international news are once again connected with the seven industrial countries of the West. There they remain unsure whether Moscow ought to be given a lot of money on credit. There is some progress, however: It has been announced that Kohl is to meet Gorbachev on 5 July and that Bush is willing to meet Mikhail Sergeyevich on 17 July. At the same time Bush wants to establish for himself the simple issue of whether the president is capable of continuing the reforms, bearing in mind the forces which oppose him. The reforms remain the main condition for U.S. assistance.

Foreign Ministry on CSCE, Other Issues

Roundup on Briefing

LD2406214991 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—A Soviet evaluation of the results of last week's session of the Foreign Ministers' Council of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was set out by Yuriy Deryabin, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Directorate for Security and Cooperation in Europe, at a briefing here today.

The Soviet side and its CSCE partners agreed that expectations concerning the council's session were fulfilled. A big step was made in implementation of the charter of Paris and further institutionalisation and the establishment of new structures of the Helsinki process.

Then a number of reports on international matters were made by Vitaliy Churkin, head of the ministry's Information Directorate.

Churkin officially announced that a meeting of the Foreign Ministers' Council of the USSR and union republics will be held in Minsk on June 28.

The ministers will discuss matters connected with enhancing the coordination of the activities of the foreign ministries of the USSR and union republics in international cooperation to eliminate the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident and the refinement of cooperation between the foreign ministries of the USSR and union republics in consular support for external relations, and other items.

The diplomat expressed concern over deviations from the universally recognised norms of investigation and judicial proceedings in Kuwait during the current trials of people guilty of crimes in the period of the Iraqi occupation.

Churkin described reports about Soviet manufacturers' ostensible readiness to sell up-to-date fighter-interceptors to Israel as not reflecting the Soviet government's policy.

"According to reports reaching here, the USSR minister of the aircraft industry, speaking at the Bourget air show, stated the readiness of Soviet manufacturers to sell the defensive version of the Mig-31 fighter-interceptor to Israel," the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

"In this connection I want to emphasise that the sale of armaments to foreign countries, including Israel of course, is the prerogative of the government," Churkin said.

If the Japanese side does not accept the Soviet Union's invitation to send its observers to Soviet Pacific Fleet exercises from August 14-16, this step would give rise to "surprise and disappointment in Moscow," Churkin stated.

The above-mentioned invitation is one of of the Soviet Union's unilateral steps towards confidence-building measures in the Far East. In so doing the USSR does not link its actions with any steps by Japan in response, Churkin emphasised.

During a question-and-answer session, Churkin confirmed that Damanskiy Island had really become part of Chinese territory, because under the agreement on the establishment of the border in its eastern part, signed during the recent Sino-Soviet summit, part of the border now runs along the fairway of rivers and the island turned out to be south of the borderline.

Churkin confirmed that preparation was under way for a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty countries, to be held in Prague.

The Soviet side will be represented at the meeting by Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev. Minister of Foreign Affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will also be a member of the delegation, Churkin said.

Deryabin on CSCE

LD2406195291 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondent Alexandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—A Soviet evaluation of the results of last week's session of the Foreign Ministers' Council of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was set out by Yuriy Deryabin, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Directorate for Security and Cooperation in Europe, at a briefing here today.

He recalled that the council had been set up in accordance with the charter of Paris as the main forum for political consultations. Thus the very fact of the holding of the session signifies an impulse to the implementation of the decisions of the Paris CSCE summit held in November last year.

Firstly, this was the first meeting of all CSCE participants after the Paris summit and, secondly, it was the first meeting of such format on German soil following German reunification, Deryabin said.

The Soviet side and its CSCE partners have agreed that expectations concerning the council session were fulfilled. A big step was made in implementation of the charter of Paris and in further institutionalisation and the establishment of new structures of the Helsinki process, Deryabin said.

The CSCE foreign ministers compared their approaches to a new architecture of Europe, the correlation between the CSCE process and organisations existing in Europe, the Soviet diplomat said.

"A number of our partners, without denying the importance of the CSCE process, put to the fore the North Atlantic Alliance, the Western European Union, the European Community, the Council of Europe and other organisations," he said.

"Soviet Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh set out our approach which is that the CSCE process should be a priority from the viewpoint of creating future security and cooperation structures in Europe.

"We admit that in the current transitional period there are structures that have proven their worth and that they should be used. But it would be wrong to try to perpetuate them. European security and stability presuppose the need for a deep transformation of all structures and their unification so that new structures would cover the entire continent".

The CSCE foreign ministers decided to begin consultations about a mandate for future talks of all European countries on security and disarmament in Europe in Vienna in September, Deryabin said.

He also singled out the decision taken at the council session in Berlin about a conflict prevention centre. The senior officials committee of the CSCE Council of Ministers is to draft regulations to broaden the functions of such a centre.

In response to a question about Baltic republics' involvement in the CSCE process, Deryabin recalled that the question of relationship between the centre and union republics is an internal affair of the USSR and that it may not be the subject of international discussion.

"We did not object to discussing this issue within the context of the observance of human rights and freedoms," Deryabin said. "Earlier a number of states raised the question of granting a certain status to these republics to enable their representatives to participate in the CSCE process.

"We proceed from international realities: In accordance with the Helsinki Final Act, independent sovereign states are CSCE members, whereas the status of the Baltic republics is regulated by the Constitution and legislation of the USSR," Deryabin said.

Churkin on Kuwaiti 'Deviations'

LD2406155891 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, speaking at a briefing here today, voiced concern over deviations from universally recognised norms of investigation and judicial proceedings during current trials in Kuwait of people guilty of crimes over the period of the Iraqi occupation.

The Soviet Union firmly condemned Iraq's aggression against Kuwait from the very outset and consistently sought the restoration of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the state of Kuwait, Vitaliy Churkin told the briefing.

"No one, of course, disputes Kuwait's right to punish—in accordance with law—people guilty of excesses and crimes on its soil during the Iraqi occupation period," he said.

However, the spokesman said, there have been reports in recent days that during trials in Kuwait there were deviations from universally recognized norms of investigation and judicial proceedings, and that death sentences are passed," which, he said, "cannot but give rise to mounting concern."

"One brutality cannot be justified by another one. A trial should not turn into a cruel reprisal," Churkin said.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman voiced hope that "ours and other statements expressing concern will be heeded in Kuwait."

Gorbachev Greets Socialist International

LD2406155191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 4 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 24 June. (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has sent Willy Brandt, chairman of the Socialist International, a greeting on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the reconstruction of the Socialist International.

"Cooperation between the CPSU and the parties of the Socialist International is becoming more and more regular and richer in content," the greeting says. "I hope

that it will continue fruitfully along the general lines of the democratic forces' activity for the sake of peace and social progress."

Roundtable Discusses CSCE, Security, Relations

LD2306205391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Jun 91

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, political observer of IZVESTIYA; Vsevolod Ivanovich Sovva, deputy head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information, Administration; and Vladimir Georgiyevich Pasko, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio]

[Excerpts] [Kobysh] Hello, Comrades! The main event in international life over the past week has undoubtedly been the first sitting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of CSCE member states, which has been held in Berlin. [passage omitted]

[Sovva] Practically everything has changed. If 16 years ago it was a question of military threat, of how to make oneself secure, if then,—why mince words?—we were fending off the so- called third basket—I mean the problem of human rights—then now everything has changed. The Warsaw Pact as such, the military organization of the Warsaw Pact does not exist at all. This is a subject for a special discussion, but it is a fact. And, basically, nothing tragic has happened. One cannot say that Soviet people are now living in fear of a military attack, a military threat, on the part of the West, NATO, or any of the member countries of NATO. [passage omitted]

To say that we were quite right when we then fended off the third basket—no, I think we were not right. I would not attempt to say that we were completely wrong, that we behaved stupidly, because one cannot pull this or that aspect of history out of context. At the moment it seemed to us, and perhaps not without justification, that the military questions were at the center of attention, they were the main ones, and perhaps if it had not been our persistent stance, we would not have arrived now at the situation where medium-range weapons, I mean nuclear weapons, have been destroyed, and the practical matter is on the agenda of the significant destruction of heavy weapons, of the signing of a treaty on strategic offensive nuclear weapons. [passage omitted]

The geography of Europe in this hall, in the hall of the Reichstag, also looked slightly different from former times, because the Soviet delegation included representatives from a number of our republics which are situated in the European part of the Union. The point is that it was proposed to all the 10 republics in the Union [as heard] that they take part at foreign minister level within the Soviet delegation. Well, as has already been reported in the press, Georgia declined this proposal, and the Baltic republics preferred attending as guests—there is such a protocol possibility—within the Scandinavian delegation. This, of course, is the prerogative of each republic, but I want to stress that guests can only listen, and, even then, not to everything, so to speak, at the sittings, in that way. They are not invited to closed sittings. Therefore, here naturally, the republics themselves had the opportunity to take part in the creative process. And it was very pleasant for me to see at a distance from Moscow the very businesslike and specific way in which the delegations from the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Moldova spoke on the screens of the world and Europe in particular. And besides this, corresponding delegations also took part from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and, naturally, for the first time the Russian delegation made itself felt, as a part of our Soviet delegation.

[Pasko] The line of European unification was, in essence, the central one in the speech by our minister of foreign affairs. How do we see the future of our continent? First, there should be a single area. This means the unification of the participating states around the solution of zone-wide tasks within which the pan-European process is developing. European security and stability presuppose a transfer to structures that cover the whole continent, not just part of it. The CSCE process must not be subordinated either to NATO objectives or to the political purposes of other existing European formations.

I would like to note that this position is similar to the opinions of other countries, above all, European counties. Here is what Kohl said at the beginning of the meeting about how Germany sees the basis on which the new European architecture should be built: These are the CSCE process, the Council of Europe, the European Community, the North Atlantic Union, and the process of control over armaments and disarmament. France, as we all know, at the end of last year proposed the idea of a European confederation. Paris sees the future of Europe as a continent of independent states united through the solution of common tasks. The confederation idea, in spirit, is close to our idea of a common European home.

Of course, everyone is interested in the views of the United States on the new Europe. The U.S. approach to this issue is determined by its striving to preserve the North Atlantic alliance under the conditions of self-liquidation of the Warsaw Pact. The issue of the role of NATO has been one of the central ones for more than a year now. What should the functions of this organization be under the new circumstances? The NATO members themselves favor preserving the alliance as a coordinating center for Western policy, a connecting link between the United States and Western Europe.

It seems to me that this approach cannot give rise to objections. There is something, however, that gives rise to objections. First, is the preservation of the NATO military organization in the absence of the Warsaw Pact military organization. The NATO members have found a justification for this in the fact that the Soviet Union remains a new [as heard] military power, and in the uncontrollability, according to them, of the situation in

the Soviet Union, as well as the continuing tension in areas adjoining Europe. It seems to me that these arguments are not very convincing. It is clear that as long as the NATO military organization exists, we must preserve our armed forces at an appropriate level. The preservation of the military organization of NATO is a brake on the road to further demilitarization of Europe.

But an even greater objection, to my mind, is the role assigned by the United States to NATO as a dominating center in the system of European security. It seems to me that hegemonic approaches are evident here. It is not possible to realize the principles of a charter for a new Europe with approaches of this kind. These principles are only able to be realized when there is full equality of all the participants in the European process. The leading role here should probably be allocated to bodies in which all the states are represented.

The Americans feel the weakness of their position. In this respect, a softening of their approach is noteworthy. On the eve of the meeting, Secretary of State Baker spoke at the Aspen Institute in Berlin about the idea of creating a European-Atlantic structure from Vancouver to Vladivostok. Here is what he said, in part: The transatlantic community should include the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union. Baker proposed setting up a special mission of the Council of Security and Cooperation on human rights, supported the idea voiced by Beesmertnykh in this respect, and supported the establishment of chambers of commerce within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. These are interesting statements. Nevertheless, the tendency to retain previous structures is evident in the position of the United States.s

Our position is that everything should be dominated by the idea of one Europe.

[Sovva] I would like to add a thing or two to what you have said, so that our listeners do not get the impression that everything is fine, everything has been agreed, and there are no obstacles to the creation of a peaceful European home. That is not so. Unfortunately, very complex processes are underway. The very fact that there is no Warsaw Pact but there is NATO, which I have already spoken about, this is not normal. The Soviet Union has become a country without allies. NATO is a bloc of allied states, but allied against whom? Perhaps I should say that they are allied for the sake of defense, but defense in connection with what threat? All these questions need answers. So far there have been no clear answers to these questions.

Let me reflect awhile. I am somewhat concerned about ideas that have appeared in NATO and that have not necessarily come from Washington. They could have been born within NATO itself, although there was probably cooperation here since, I think, they are connected with the course of the Persian Gulf war. There is the idea of creating a kind of NATO rapid deployment force that could operate beyond the bounds of the European Continent. What is this? Who is going to take part? Under what circumstances? It is not just in our country that this is giving rise to concern, but throughout the so called third—or perhaps even fourth—world. As far as everyone is concerned, Saddam Husayn was clearly an aggressor. But if we recall the Falklands war, when Britain was defending what was clearly its colonial possession, the Falkland Islands, it beat Argentina through its might, by bringing to the Falkland Islands and thrusting straight into the inferno of war, so to speak, nuclear weapons, which fortunately were not used. All this gives rise to justified alarm.

Now let's talk about why NATO is not proposing to dissolve itself, as happened with the Warsaw Pact. Let us be frank. I think this is, above all, because, for them, the Soviet threat has not disappeared. For them, it has transformed. Now it looks completely different. They do not think—they meaning NATO leaders—that the Soviet Union can attack anyone. Of course, they are very worried by what is happening in our country. They do not rule out the possibility of an explosion in the Soviet Union that could have the most dangerous consequences for the world and the security of European states. A document has been adopted on Yugoslavia, about which you spoke, Vladimir Georgiyevich. That is a very serious thing—a document on Yugoslavia. That means that they are very concerned in NATO by what is happening. There is a basis for this, because the country is boiling and seething. If we recall that it is there that the first world war began, these historical associations acquire substance.

I am not saying this to justify the existance of the NATO military mechanism; it will gradually have to be reduced to naught. I am trying to follow the thinking of the NATO leaders who keep looking with worry at what is happening in the East. Much now depends on how we are going to cope with our tasks and how the East European states are going to cope with theirs. Basically, a fairly tense and dramatic process is underway, which by no means could be called rosy or calm. We do not have any of that.

[Kobysh] That is right. Now new structures are being created. Let us remember that only a beginning has been made, because the structures following from the Paris Charter have many aspects. This means new structures in Europe, the creation of a permanent secretariat of the council of foreign ministers, a crisis prevention center, and probably a whole number of other structures. As our foreign minister said, these will either strengthen existing structures or eliminate them.

Of course, we should permanently be aware of the specific disparity that has arisen in the position of the West and the Soviet Union, which indeed has no allies like it had in the Warsaw Pact. The architecture of this home is going to be created gradually, but naturally under constant attention from all the participants, because we are going to speak frankly about things we do

not like. If, for instance, there is an unnecessary concentration of troops underway, or something else, that should be subject to negotiations. For instance, we can look at tactical nuclear weapons. So far, for all intents and purposes, these have been outside the equation. That is a very serious block. Now, when it has been said that we had these tactical nuclear weapons in the GDR and we were withdrawing them from Germany, this in itself is a sufficiently serious argument for NATO, I would say.

Naturally, only a beginning has been made, an exchange of views on a multilateral basis. Let us recall that in Berlin many meetings took place on bilateral basis. Many of these probably have not even made it into the press, because it is difficult for the press to follow when you have 35 ministers constantly communicating with each other. They discuss not agenda issues but some specific business issues of mutual relations. In this respect, I would like to single out two meetings. The first meeting is that between Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh and Secretary of State Baker, where issues going beyond Europe's bounds were discussed. They talked about the strategic offensive weapons treaty. More reservations are being removed, thereby clearing the path toward a summit meeting. The second meeting is that between our foreign minister and German Foreign Minister Genscher. Here, too, is an example of the new approach. The two ministers spoke to servicemen from the Western Group of Forces and the Bundeswehr. That is something one could hardly contemplate even a few months ago.

[Pasko] Nonetheless, comrades, I would like to remark that remnants of the old approaches remain. Just take the question of the economy. The question of helping or not helping the Soviet Union has already been discussed for a long time. If the Soviet Union is to be helped, then in what form? Just look at this aid. Let us put aside now the question of how we look at this aid. It is interesting to look at how the West is looking at this aid. After all, attempts to haggle for political concessions are clearly evident. I do not just mean Japan, which links the granting of assistance to the Soviet Union with territorial concessions. There are also the recommendations of the International Monetary Fund. What did the latest ones consist of? Not giving anything until economic reforms, political reforms, and so forth are carried out.

[Kobysh] Yes. Here there is a certain incorrectness. Of course, they say that aid will only be granted to those countries that have firmly embarked on the path to a market economy. Well, I realize that from that point of view it may be sensible, desirable, and rational, but why should all countries embark on the path to a market economy? Maybe Albania does not want to embark on the path to a market economy. It has entered the family of European peoples as a member with full rights, ready to fulfill all the obligations assumed. Maybe it will take some other course, not the course of a market economy. So does this mean one must not help it? One must help it. Here, of course, there is a weakness. You said correctly, Vladimir Georgiyevich, that there are remnants of the old days.

[Sovva] Vitaliy Ivanovich, forgive me, but the Westerners themselves are warning us all the time to look cautiously at the capitalist economy. There was an encyclical from the pope, in which he said very distinctly that capitalism is far from an ideal.

[Pasko] That is very wise.

[Sovva] In addition to the pope, there are statements by both economists and politicians who warn us about the mistakes inherent in the Western economy. There has just been a very interesting utterance by Jacques Delors, in which he assessed the situation in our country quite soberly and the necessity of steps by the West to implement economic reforms. The meeting of our president with the participants in the G-7 conference will be productive, I think.

[Kobysh] Unfortunately, on the one hand it seems marvellous that the Soviet republics have acquired sovereignty and statehood, but the question arises of whether we now have several foreign policies. There is a question of whether this will hinder our union, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or, if they agree, the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics. Here there is a question, because the policy, even of a federal state, should, of course, be unified. This is shown by the experience of other federations.

[Passage omitted]

[Kobysh] One cannot fail to note the speech at the joint sitting of chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet by Comrade Gorbachev. This speech was an excellent answer to critics of the president's stance on the cardinal issues of the country's domestic and foreign policy. I will only highlight two aspects from this speech, in my view the most substantial. The first is that beyond the bounds of our country its destiny is not decided. It is decided here, within, by all of us. The second point is the precisely followed through thought that we should, and must, resolve the tasks before us by democratic means. This last point concerns not just us. [passage omitted]

If one looks at the postwar history of Europe, and not only of Europe, it is not hard to see that despite all vicissitudes, both at the national and international level, this was movement toward democracy. Since April 1985 this movement has been accelerated. It is very important to reinforce this pace. Of course, very much depends on us.

With this, comrades, permit me to finish our meeting today. Thank you very much for participating in it. All the best!

Shishlin Views 'Superpower' Status Issue

PM2106222591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Political observer Nikolay Shishlin "View from Moscow" article: "Will the USSR Remain a Great Power?"]

[Text] The question contained in the headline of this article has for several months now been the constant topic of discussion on the pages of the world press. It has been coming up particularly since the short-lived war in the Persian Gulf. Why did the long-standing Soviet ally prove insolvent [nesostoyatelnyy], they ask? Although it would be more correct and more accurate to note that the outcome of the crisis in the Gulf was predetermined not only by the military potential of the United States and the anti-Iraq coalition, but also by the changes in the world's political landscape. Saddam Husayn did not see, or did not want to see, the emergence and widespread recognition of the new political thinking. He thought, despite all the warnings, that in the new conditions he would be able to play according to the old rules. The result is known.

But the war in the Gulf is only a side-issue. The views about the Soviet Union's loss of its status as a great power have sprouted on the soil of our own troubles and disorders. And these troubles and disorders are no invention. The state of the economy is deplorable. Production both in industry and the agrarian sector is shrinking dangerously. Prices are soaring. The vigorous work in Novo-Ogarevo on the new Union Treaty was undertaken in the absence of six republics. Furthermore, a successful completion of this work does not guarantee that the flame of ethnic passions will swiftly subside. The political situation is characterized by strivings for common sense and innovation, as well as by nostalgia for old times, by daring spurts forward and paralyzing fear, by impatience and apathy, by hope and despair. Society is in turmoil.

Drowning out the foreign choruses, this is being proclaimed day and night from various rostrums by many a home-grown Demosthenes in uniform and in civilian clothing who parade as patriots. The patriots are cunning. They are paying lip service to glasnost, to democracy, and to economic reforms, but in practice they are sniping at all the goals of the spring of 1985. And the country's foreign policy—what is known as the new political thinking—is also in for its share. There is no need to cite quotations to this effect. They are ringing in everyone's ears. I will try and compile an albeit incomplete register of the accusations in this sphere.

First: Loss of the countries of Central and East Europe, dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and of CEMA or—in the language of the past—the disintegration of the socialist camp.

Comment. There is no need to prove that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and other formerly allied countries belong to their own peoples. Their right to decide their own path of development, which they have chosen to exercise, is not open to question. Changing people's persuasions with the help of tanks and assault troops is more trouble than it is worth. It turns out that it was the teachers rather than the pupils who were bad. And finally it was an authoritative teacher—life and practical experience itself—which has made us listen.

I am aware how painful and difficult the change of direction in neighboring states is. Today they represent a gigantic social laboratory, and for us, who are busy with the renewal of our own country, it is very useful to assess in a considered and precise manner their diverse and dissimilar experiences. And one more point.

Ties with our neighbors on the Western borders of our country have to be treasured. In my opinion it was rash to switch to convertible currency in the settlement of our economic accounts. It is necessary to proceed in this direction, but not by the method of leaps into the dark. It will be tragic if, in the current times of transition, our ties in the sphere of culture wear thin and break, and if human contacts are frozen.. These ties are irreplaceable.

The new political landscape is unfamiliar. The pull of our former allies toward the West is quite obvious. But let us note something else—our neighbors are certainly not interested in turning their backs on the East. It is quite feasible for our political relations with them to be enriched. They will be different, they are changing already. They incorporate bitter memories of the past, and the froth of former grievances. But what is important is that they are now truly equal relations. The art of taking each other's interests into account has to be learned by everyone.

The bad weeds of the past will wither away, they are fading already, but all that was good and sound in our cooperation will not perish, it is sprouting new shoots and will bear fruit.

Second: The unification of Germany has caused irreparable damage to the European interests of the USSR. The Germans should have been made to pay much more for the withdrawal of our troops. Our foreign affairs department displayed neither persistence, nor determination, nor skill in the settlement of the German issue.

Comment. Let us ask ourselves some simple questions. Was it normal that for almost 50 years after the end of the war there was one change of the guard after another on the spot where it had ended? Was it normal for a great people having to pay decade after decade for the evil deeds of their Nazi rulers? Is it necessary for us in the new strategic situation, with sophisticated and totally destructive military hardware at our disposal, to live with 40-year old notions of security and to continue to build up our military muscle?

The answers to these questions are self-evident. Just as it is self-evident that with the unification of Germany a step, probably the decisive step, was taken toward a

peaceful, good neighborly Europe free from hostility, hatred, and pathological mistrust. There were also other major steps, but this one, I repeat, was the decisive one.

Third: Soviet foreign policy has been playing and continues to play a give-away game with the United States. At the disarmament talks we are agreeing to bigger cuts than the United States is making. Our privileged partners in the Third World are disappearing one after another—Yemen, Mozambique, Angola, Iraq, Ethiopia.... Who will be next? We are having to withdraw our troops from European countries while the Americans are maintaining their military presence. And so forth....

Comment. I have no intention of denying that the establishment of new relations between the USSR and the United States was greatly facilitated by our renunciation of the course toward unrestrained confrontation in all areas, and by the orientation toward the principle of reasonable sufficiency in respect of armaments. Incidentally, both the Soviet Union and the United States have a very long way to go to achieve reasonable sufficiency. However, to assume that only the Soviet approach to Washington has changed, while the United States' view of Moscow has not changed, would mean ignoring realities. Our countries have jointly cleared the minefield to make room for cooperation. The milestones on this road were Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, Moscow, New York, and Washington. And a new meeting in Moscow is in the offing.

With the dismantling of the Warsaw Pact, NATO too is beginning to change. It is true that people in the West continue to extol their bloc. However, both the United States and Britain, and not only they, are planning to sharply reduce the numerical strength of their armed forces and armaments in Germany in the next few years, and a relatively low ceiling has been set for the Bundeswehr. NATO circles are officially favoring the establishment of multifaceted ties not just with the countries of Central and East Europe, but also with the Soviet Union. I have no doubt that the development of the all-European process will, as time goes on, increasingly erode obsolete notions of security, and that new truly all-European institutes will be created. The future belongs to them.

As for the changes in our relations with a number of Third World countries, they have, first, changed in different ways, and second, it is a plus rather than a minus that we have a Soviet rather than an Ethiopian, Mozambiquan, or Iraqi policy in the various parts of the world. Let us hope that the Soviet Union will be able to, in parallel or jointly with the United States, with other countries, and with the United Nations, help rid international relations of regional conflicts.

Normal full-blooded relations between the USSR and the United States are an indispensable element of the establishment of a peaceful world order. It is impossible to imagine a safe world without Soviet-U.S. cooperation.

Our domestic critics, shooting arrows at the policy of new political thinking and abusing reformers from Gorbachev and Yakovlev to Yeltsin and Shevardnadze, are depicting our assets as our liabilities. They do not have a good word to say even about such obvious and weighty results as the easing of the burden of military spending, the withdrawal from Afghanistan, and the complete normalization of relations with China (no one has as yet calculated what a burden for the country the enmity with China was), and much else. It is a deliberate untruth to claim that the Soviet Union is a captive of the changes. Our country has been an active initiator of the processes which have already produced the end of the "cold war" and opened up scope for the development of a world civilization free from walls and barriers. This is a role befitting a great power. It marks a real increase in international prestige.

A clever man, arguing with foreign Sovietologists claiming that the Soviet Union has allegedly lost its great-power status, put a sensible question to them: Do you mean to say that when the Soviet Union under the Stalinist regime was covered with a network of concentration camps and when the infernal machine for the extermination of its own citizens was at work, our country was a great power, and that it remained a great power when Stalin's successors in the sixties and seventies embarked on the road of superarmament, but that now, having given up Messianic ambitions, and affirming the philosophy of the new political thinking by words and by actions, the Soviet Union has lost its former role?

The logical flaws of the arguments of those who are in a hurry to demote the Soviet Union to the ranks of second-rate powers are blatantly obvious. The prestige and authority of the Soviet Union in the world are rising rather than waning as a result of our focus on universal human values. The prestige and authority of the Soviet Union are growing rather than diminishing as a result of the country embarking, painfully and with difficulty, on the road of renewal. The prestige and authority of our country are soaring rather than slipping as we discard dogmas and obtuse scholastics and attach paramount importance to the demands of life, to the demands of people rather than the demands of the doctrine.

As for the traditional criteria by which people are used to measure whether a power is great or not—we possess them all. We have a vast territory with unique natural resources. We have a talented people with a tragic and a glorious fate and a great history which, no matter what the skeptics say, contains many lessons. And we have missiles and nuclear warheads. Although it is obvious that it is not these which should count first and foremost.

Our own lessons, a sober evaluation of the path which we have traversed, and the world experience are the cradle of the strategy of revival which comprises the dual task of ridding ourselves of the heavy burden of delusions, errors, and crimes of the past and forming a new vision of the future in which nothing valuable from our past

will be lost. Alongside the theoretical quest, a practical beginning has been made in creating the material, social, and spiritual building blocks from which the new civilization will be built.

To say that this work is proceeding with difficulty is no great revelation. Many people are confused. Hence the desire to pull the blanket of silence over their heads and wallow in visions of the past. Hence the emergence of a multitude of noisy politicos specializing in assembling bouquets of slips and errors by those politicians who dared to overcome political color blindness and call what is black "black," and what is white "white." Hence also the sharp turns in the actions of the country's political leadership which do occur. Our road is uncharted and where it seemed there would be no potholes or ruts, obstacles which are difficult to surmount loom up suddenly.

But it is a road which has been chosen. And by any criteria, the political distance which has been covered is considerable. Anyone who doubts this should ponder the results of the presidential elections in Russia. The votes in favor of B.N. Yeltsin are votes in favor of a radicalization of the policy of reforms. They are votes in favor of the firm establishment of democracy and human rights, and the development of healthy, normal production relations. And let me add: They are votes in favor of the development of cooperation between M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, which was outlined in April this year in the well-known "Nine plus One" statement, and now also in the draft Union Treaty.

Does this benefit our country's international positions? Of course it does.

This is a steep climb in the life of the fatherland. And we will be able to master it if we do not turn our back on the changes which have long been knocking on our door in ethnic relations, in the economy, and in the development of the political process. Society is ripe for this. We will be able to master it if the natural clash of views does not deteriorate into a "witch-hunt," if the party and the parties and various social movements are motivated by concern for the fatherland rather than for securing the best place for themselves in the political sun, if we add to our achievements in making speeches also the useful skill of listening and hearing.

The Soviet Union is not rolling backward, it is going forward, albeit in fits and starts. Its present development, its quest and its insights are helping to create a better world for tomorrow and a sensible structure of the universal human community. It is going forward, but it is not on its own, it is not proceeding in a fit of Messianic fervour, but by building up cooperation with all the countries of the world. This is a reliable road to strengthening the Soviet Union's role as a great power. It is the road which our country is travelling.

Fears of Western Economic Intentions Eyed

PM2406153191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

["Dialogue between Rair Simonyan, economist and specialist in international affairs, and commentator Anatoliy Druzenko"; date, place not given: "About 'Selling Off' the Motherland and the 'Siege' Mentality"]

[Text] [Druzenko] A lively and I think prematurely heated and passionate discussion of the chances of integrating our visibly faltering economy in the world economic process is taking place in our country now, on the eve of the London meeting of the "big seven" leaders. As yet only general principles of the interconnection between our reforms and possible participation by the most developed countries in their implementation have been expressed, but there are already voices issuing calls "not to let them in!" Specially "sharpened" arrows are being aimed at the program elaborated by the group of Soviet experts in conjunction with Harvard University academics and specialists. Recently the exceptionally prolific emigre commentator Eduard Limonov shared his views about this from his distant home in France in the pages of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. His verdict is categorical: "Yavlinskiy's program is a dead ringer for an act of surrender. This program opens the way for interference by rich countries headed by the United States in USSR domestic policy which is without precedent in modern history." What does this forecast show most—naivete, a desire to frighten, or, so to speak, concept-juggling?

[Simonyan] I think it shows most the "besieged fortress" mentality fostered in our country over the decades, the paradox being that no one has any intention of capturing this fortress. It is a curious phenomenon: We are utterly inadequate in our assessment of the logic and intentions of the Western business world. Remember, when, after many years of agonizing doubt, our country at long last made up its mind to create joint ventures, many people believed that Western entrepreneurs would literally come rushing into our country. And what happened? They did not rush in. Major companies and firms, at any rate. After a few years we lifted certain restrictions for joint ventures—and once again the effect was almost zero. Now we are speaking of the intention to extensively involve foreign capital in the development of the Soviet economy, and once again we are fearing some kind of "invasion." There will be no "invasion" until people **over there** believe in the seriousness of our intentions.

[Druzenko] The idea that foreign capital is hostile is almost embodied in our genes. There is a kind of "iron curtain" syndrome, a conviction that they want to conquer us without fail. Hence the widespread opinion: If we are embarking on broad cooperation with the West, we are selling off the motherland—no less.

[Simonyan] But that is crazy! This is a failure to understand the most elementary truths, mixed up with jingoism that has nothing in common with concern for the

good of the homeland. Throughout the world countries compete to attract foreign capital. And never mind countries! In the United States the governor and authorities of any state do their utmost to attract foreign companies because their capital means additional resources, employment, training, infrastructure, new technologies, and goods. Finally, it means tax payments into the local and central budget, investments in your land, and funds invested in your living standard, if you like!

[Druzenko] There is always a price to pay, as the saying goes. The investor naturally wants to obtain a return, and as much as possible: This logic suggests the thought that if we request aid, we are selling ourselves off.

[Simonyan] There is no "sale"! What makes real estate real estate is that it can be created or destroyed, but it cannot be "moved" to another place or another country. British capital was once used in the United States to construct essentially all the railroads, plants, and factories—and who gained by this? Both sides did. The Japanese are now constructing auto plants in the United States—does the American consumer suffer because of this? On the contrary, he gains, because the competition makes the U.S. auto manufacturers improve the quality of their work.

[Druzenko] The talk of "selling off" the motherland, as you will have noticed, excludes in advance the very possibility of mutually advantageous cooperation, that is, cooperation useful to both partners. How sarcastic E. Limonov is in the aforementioned article about the use of the word "collaboration": Anything you like can lurk behind this, he says—a "strong partner absorbs a weak partner or two equally strongly beat each other."

[Simonyan] It's the same old enemy image. Not even the thought that mutually acceptable relations of partnership can exist is tolerated. There simply has to be a fight, if you'll pardon the expression.

[Druzenko] The other side of "selling" is "buying." There is also a lot of talk about this: If we approach them cap in hand, it is argued, they will buy us up for a song—our wealth, brainpower, manpower, conscience....

[Simonyan] Excuse me, but this too shows a total failure to understand the nature and laws of the operation of capital. Yet this is in our country, in a land where Marxism is the official ideology! I recently returned from Germany. People there are only beginning to realize how hard it will be to "digest" the East European economic space. For instance, I visited a plant that has been bought by the "Siemens" company. According to the standards of the former CEMA, it was quite a decent enterprise producing electronic apparatus. And what is the situation? It transpires that all the equipment and output need to be replaced and new buildings need to be constructed (that is cheaper than modernizing the old ones). That is not all: The infrastructure, transportation, and communications are no good, everything has to be changed. Plus the expenditure on land recultivation. In short, it would be easier for West German companies to swamp residents of East Germany with their goods than to invest in obsolete enterprises. But, as the saying goes, social responsibility demands sacrifices. This is in the former GDR, not in the USSR. By contrast we, pardon the expression, are sitting around up to our ears in something and are still afraid that someone will "pinch" something from us.

[Druzenko] Let us not forget either that any Western company today can choose what country to invest in. It takes very powerful arguments to make them earmark capital for a particular project. With few exceptions, as yet we look by no means "attractive" to them. It is no accident that people in the West say that only a madman can put money into a bottomless barrel. That notorious "barrel" seemingly is a symbol of our own economy.

[Simonyan] As for the fear that we will be bought up for a song, this too reflects our primitive method of "economic" thinking: You grab whatever is lying around and pick it up for a song. But whatever is lying around is exactly what nobody in the West needs. It would never occur to anyone there to put money into enterprises just because they are cheap. That would be to tie up capital that can be used more profitably.

[Druzenko] You are talking largely about the existing production potential in our country. But when people say that we are going to be "bought up," they principally mean our natural resources.

[Simonyan] I agree that this is a sphere into which Western capital may move. Although in this respect too we are by no means as unique as some people want to make out. There are plenty of natural resources in the world, including oil, for instance. So here too they can pick and choose. And they will come to us if they think it is useful for themselves. Suppose they do think it useful, what then? Will they immediately engage in robbery? Come on, I can assure you than no one is going to inflict greater losses on us that we inflict on ourselves. Nowhere else are methods of exploiting natural resources as predatory and wasteful as they are in our country.

[Druzenko] Apparently, if we follow the "patriotic" argument, everything can continue to go down the drain. Neither side will get it?

[Simonyan] Exactly. But if you look to the future, foreign companies can invest money in exploiting deposits which we will have neither the resources nor the technological potential to open up in the foreseeable future. I am sure that our grandchildren, whom certain people are so fond of citing, will only be grateful to us if, instead of taking pleasure in being a dog in a manger, we place the resources that would otherwise lie around idle in the service of the people (and our grandchildren), albeit with the help of capital from outside.

[Druzenko] I think we are clearly too quick to predict some kind of economic "expansion" by the West also if

you bear in mind the organizational and legal aspects. We still have to formulate "rules of the joint game"—normal rules consonant with common sense and in no way reminiscent of the present rules. At present so far as Western entrepreneurs are concerned our life in general and economic life in particular remains a total looking-glass world. Many people despair at the merry-go-round of legislative acts, restrictions, and red tape.

[Simonyan] You know "Mars" chocolate bars? They were once on sale in our country for a few rubles after New Year. "Mars" is a major U.S. confectionery firm. Consider this: In order to "attract" the firm to its country, the Austrian Government granted it—a foreign firm, notice—several hectares of land for the construction of a factory for a symbolic payment of 1 schilling.

[Druzenko] Weren't the Austrian patriots indignant?

[Simonyan] Not so far as I know. Okay, last year the "Mars" leadership decided to set up a modern confectionery production unit in our country. What is the essence of the project? Using their own money, they want to construct factories, create the infrastructure and transport and storage facilities, and train workers and managers. And what has happened? Nothing! For almost a year the Americans have been struggling to implement the project, but they cannot break through the Soviet bureaucracy. There are masses of similar cases! And they show just one thing: Before shouting from the housetops that the "country is being sold off," we should consider whether the conditions exist in our country for the development of large-scale economic cooperation with the developed Western countries. And on a fundamentally new basis, for it is not primarily a question of credits, nor even of "minor repairs" to our economic mechanism. We have to design a qualitatively new economy—then we will be treated as reputable partners, not as cadgers.

[Druzenko] I want to continue the thought about rules of the game. The people who uphold the "Do not let them in!" strategy for some reason believe that the possible revolution in our economic cooperation with the West will be implemented in an unruly, uncontrolled, and unchecked fashion. But why? That is absurd! Who would deny that provision certainly must be made here for mechanisms protecting our state's interests and precluding situations where one partner does what he likes while the other goes along with everything because, as the saying goes, he doesn't care whether he lives high on the hog...

[Simonyan] Certainly. The mechanisms you mention definitely must prevent infringing of our national interests by ensuring truly equal partnership. For instance, I do not rule out the possibility that Western countries may attempt to sell "yesterday's" technologies on our market—there naturally needs to be protection against this. And also against the siting of environmentally "dirty" production facilities in our country, a bias toward the development only of extractive, "raw material" sectors here, the saturation of our consumer market with unsalable consumer goods, and so forth.

[Druzenko] So far as I am aware, the "Consent to Opportunity" program prepared by our Center for Economic and Political Research and Harvard University particularly singles out the principles that must predetermine the necessary equality of the partners. It highlights three tasks. First of all it is necessary to ensure **mutual advantage for the sides.** Only clear interests can serve as the basis for resolute action. Next it envisages **gradual, step-by-step, strategic collaboration between the sides.** In other words, a joint plan will be drawn up on the basis of a clear concept of action proceeding from the basic principles of the market economy. Finally, the third task is to **attain consent to interdependence of actions.** For, it is clear, neither the Soviet Union nor the Western countries will brook interference in internal affairs. That is, the actions of each side must be strictly coordinated with the partner's actions, coordinated in such a way as to ensure the objective preconditions for success.

[Simonyan] We have to grasp that the integration of our economy in the world economic space is an extremely complex, tricky, profound, phased task and it will take years, massive efforts, a whole range of reforms, and the reassessment of obsolete values and ideological aims that have lost their basis for existence. It is precisely this that the hasty "critics" who are scaring us with the bogey of the "slavery" that allegedly awaits us refuse to understand or pretend not to understand.

[Druzenko] And what is the noteworthy point? They are scaring people but are not putting forward any serious alternative programs nor answering the question: "What is to be done?" You cannot regard as programs the rambling talk of the immutability of socialist ideals and the clear nostalgia for the "order" that was maintained by the entire former might of the administrative system. But what except new privations can its return bring the people?

[Simonyan] That is exactly the point. And the danger. Taking refuge behind the slogan "Look out, the country is being robbed!" they are trying to take us back. To the "besieged fortress" that we have already experienced. **They** did not capture our fortress, they simply vanished far beyond the horizon. So far beyond that we, who were still ostensibly besieged, could not see them.

[Druzenko] It will be very annoying if we fail to "see" and take advantage of probably our last opportunity to escape the economic looking-glass world.

Concern at WEU Intelligence, Military Role

PM1906143891 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[A. Baryshev article: "Watchful Eye—A New Multilateral Intelligence Structure Is Being Created in Europe"]

[Text] A few days ago the WEU [West European Union] (the 12 European Community states minus Denmark, Greece, and Ireland) adopted a decision to set up their own intelligence directorate. This was reported in the all-Europe newspaper THE EUROPEAN. The new organization's stated aim is to evaluate the threat to the security of West European countries. From where might such a threat arise? According to those promoting this initiative, it stems as before from the East, from the Soviet Union.

The report in THE EUROPEAN went somewhat unnoticed by international observers. Even though, it is worth paying some attention to it. After all, the issue is about forming a powerful multilateral intelligence structure within the confines of the WEU, which is steadily acquiring all the trademarks of a military political bloc.

Of course, the individual secret services' activities will not yet become a thing of the past, in West or East. In Europe's new political climate, however, about which so much is said nowadays, it would clearly be more fitting to reduce such activity. But an initiative like the one revealed in THE EUROPEAN can in no way be added to the list of measures to strengthen trust between sides so recently in a state of conflict and divided by the notorious Berlin Wall. Neither does it concur with the Paris Charter, which was signed by the leaders of 34 states and proclaims the end of an era of confrontation and division and the ascendancy of an element of trust.

To all appearances, the planned affair will be devised on a large scale. It became apparent that representatives of the nine WEU member country governments will discuss concrete plans for organizing a single center as early as June. At first, the center will process and evaluate information received from U.S. and French spy satellites. By the end of this century, Europe will send its own intelligence satellite into orbit.

Apart from the satellites monitoring military bases and facilities on the territory of the Soviet Union and the Baltic region, it can be supposed that military ships and aircraft belonging to WEU member countries will also be involved in electronic reconnaissance.

As THE EUROPEAN stressed, the decision to create an all-Europe intelligence center breaks with current tradition, according to which the West European countries only share the results of data collected and processed by each of them individually. "It prompts important questions on cooperation with the United States in this and other defense areas, as well as the role of NATO, and it will increase arguments over whom West European countries should tend toward when ensuring their own security—NATO with its American 'connections,' or the European Community, which is France's firm preference. Britain, which has an agreement with the United States on the exchange of intelligence, could end up in a difficult position when the question of using the data received via Britain's participation in the WEU center arises."

Naturally, there is no point in exaggerating the significance of such arguments and "difficulties." When the time comes, WEU and NATO will straighten things out somehow.

For the record, a brief word on NATO. Given the quite clearly defined aims of the new European intelligence structure, it must not be forgotten that even at the North Atlantic alliance's most recent Copenhagen session at foreign minister level the participants did not resort to the irritatingly familiar incantation about the "threat from the East." (Granted, this is a first. Even in the final communique at the joint session of the NATO Military Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group in May, the Soviet Union, which is "experiencing difficulties in its political evolution" and "continues to possess awe-inspiring military potential," was listed among the "risk factors" in West Europe's security).

But it is obvious that the leaders of WEU circles, unwilling to part with stereotypes born of the old thinking, are thinking along other lines. So what is the point of talks on constructing a European home stretching from misty Albion to the Ural mountains? Is it wise in such a home to set up a procedure whereby the inhabitants of the various apartments will be watching each other through keyholes?

Undoubtedly, the creation of a single intelligence organ is closely linked with the question of the EC states' elaborating a common security policy and the discussion of the WEU's future role. As European Commission President Jacques Delors announced, "It is impossible to discuss the issue of political union without discussing the problems of creating a common security system, the basis of which is defense."

However, various opinions on the question of the WEU exist in the community to this day. Some see it as a product of the cold war, and believe that it cannot serve as a basis for Europe-wide security, which implies the participation of all states on the continent. Others suggest that it is indeed the WEU which must become the basis for creating a Europe-wide defense.

It would seem that the emergence of an intelligence directorate within the WEU can only confirm the first of these views. The latter group obviously do not want to consider the new European realities, and especially the return of Soviet troops behind their own borders, the formation of a bloc of neutral states between the USSR and Western Europe following the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the significant reductions by the USSR in line with the Paris Treaty.

Considering these facts and indeed the overall situation in a renewed Europe, it is clearly impossible to object to the recommendations and conclusions of the authors of a report by the Oxford Research Group on the problems of European security, commissioned by European Parliament deputies. They noted that in a single Europe the security structure must embrace the whole of Europe, including the Soviet Union. Partial unification would no

doubt lead to the emergence of conflicts with those states not entering the system. The most important thing is that the creation of any European organization without the USSR's participation constitutes, in the view of the report's authors, an "irreparable mistake." They believe that an all-Europe security system is only feasible within the bounds of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. They conclude that it is the CSCE which must assume responsibility for the all-Europe functions which are currently being fulfilled by such all-Europe institutions as NATO, WEU, and the EC, which have altered their original purpose and tasks. The report stresses that all the threats which NATO was intended to withstand have now disappeared, and therefore this organization should be disbanded.

It must be added that a similar fate awaits the WEU, no doubt, if we are thinking in terms of the military side of its activity. All things considered, however, it seems to be embarking upon an expansionist course of late.

Nevertheless, how can we evaluate the WEU's development in this sense, and what conclusions can be drawn for our security in this connection? (The new organs are, after all, spearheaded against us. And no secret is made of this.) Of course, we must begin from the fact that the EC's sphere of competence is spreading increasingly to the security sphere, and by the middle of the decade the formation of a common policy in the field of defense will also be launched.

We can predict two paths here: either the simple reinforcement of all WEU structures, or a rapprochement between the EC and WEU right up to a total merger. Some observers point out that against a background of the inevitable prospect for reducing the U.S. military role in NATO, this formation will to an increasing degree replace and supplant the North Atlantic alliance's military functions.

As for the Soviet Union, as a result of these changes it will in a few years time be dealing not just with an economic giant but with a political giant conducting a common defense policy. We cannot close our eyes to this. The dilemma of maintaining the WEU instead of NATO or NATO instead of the WEU holds little meaning for us. Both are worst-case scenarios.

CIA Link of Lockerbie to Libya 'Debatable'

LD2506092291 Moscow TASS in English 0857 GMT 25 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Sidorin]

[Text] San Francisco June 25 TASS—Libyan intelligence agents are to blame for the Pan Am airliner explosion, killing 270 people, above the Scottish village of Lockerbie in December 1988, according to U.S. and Scottish investigators as reported on Monday in the LOS ANGELES TIMES.

The newspaper said experts discovered new evidence overturning conclusions drawn after almost two years of investigation by thousands of agents across the world.

The initial presumption was that the offenders were to be sought among Iran-linked Palestine extremists. The new evidence is based on a tiny bit of the microelectronic circuit from the detonating device of the bomb on the plane.

The Libyan thread in the affair was discovered by a gifted young CIA analyst (as he is described by his colleagues at CIA headquarters at Langley). After a thorough search of CIA files, he pinpointed the basic similarity of the Scottish plan with that of a number of other terrorist acts.

His attention was arrested by a report on a bomb in passenger baggage that exploded on board a French airliner in Chad in 1984. The same method was used by nine terrorists who tried to blow up the U.S. Embassy in Togo using explosives packed into two suitcases. Then there was a case in Senegal, where two men were arrested at the capital airport, carrying ten kilograms of explosives, arms and several detonators. These items were made in Switzerland, just as the detonators that set off the bomb aboard the Pan Am airliner.

CIA agents are sure that Libyan agents were behind the three cases in Chad, Togo and Senegal.

What was the motive behind the crimes? Langley people say it was revenge for the U.S. air strike at Tripoli in 1986 that killed 40 people, including Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's adopted daughter.

Although the Libyan version proposed by the CIA and taken up by Scottish investigators is debatable, the LOS ANGELES TIMES says that, according to Washington officials, it will serve as the basis for transferring investigation materials to court. The move that is now being considered.

Officials Mark Customs Council Membership

LD2406210191 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Simonenko]

[Text] Brussels June 24 TASS—A session of the Customs Cooperation Council on Monday admitted the Soviet Union as its member.

The admittance had been preceded by the Soviet Union's considerable preparatory work as a council observer during five years, Thomas Hayes, the council's secretary-general, said.

He expressed hope for fruitful cooperation with Soviet customs authorities.

The admittance to the council's membership is the first step towards developing international trade cooperation with the USSR, Head of the Soviet Delegation V. Boyarov said.

This decision puts Soviet customs officers on a par with their foreign colleagues and simplifies and invigorates commercial contacts. It paves the way for the Soviet Union's admittance to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Soviet Union plans to save up to two to three billion U.S. dollars annually by introducing unified customs tariffs and a single administrative document in accordance with EC standards in the country from January 1, 1992, Boyarov said.

EBRD Plan for Soviet IMF Membership Viewed

LD2206125591 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 22 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitry Bandura]

[Text] Tokyo June 22 TASS—The question of the Soviet Union's official entry into the International Monetary Fund (IMF) will apparently be considered at a meeting of the finance ministers and directors of central banks of the group of Seven (G-7) countries, the KYODO TSUSHIN NEWS AGENCY reported from London today with reference to sources in the entourage of Japanese Finance Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto.

The finance ministers' meeting opens in the British capital on June 23.

A proposal to officially admit the USSR to the IMF is set out in a plan, prepared at the beginning of this month by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), to promote the reform of the Soviet economy.

The proposal goes beyond the idea of granting the Soviet Union a "special status" at the IMF, which is expected to be agreed upon by participants in the forthcoming meeting.

While "special status" allows only technical and advisory assistance to reforms, full IMF membership gives access to various types of financial support.

The EBRD believes that the Soviet Union's official entry into the IMF will enable the international organisation to play a more important role in transforming the Soviet financial system and resolving the foreign debt problem.

From the Japanese Government's point of view, the rendering of versatile financial assistance to the USSR is more preferable than aid on a bilateral basis, which Tokyo links with a settlement of the territorial issue, the KYODO TSUSHIN points out.

Hashimoto and other spokesmen of the Japanese Finance Ministry had earlier voiced apprehensions that Japan, with such a passive approach to support for the USSR, might find itself in isolation during the forthcoming conference of Western financiers.

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh on Conversation With Baker

OW2506023991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama—Aleksandr Bessmertnykh: Both Sides Wish To Complete Work on START As Soon as Possible"; INTERFAX headline; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] This is the text of a conversation the Soviet Foreign Minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, had with a group of journalists, Pavel Vasilyev amongst them, on his way from Berlin to Moscow. In Berlin, Bessmertnykh took part in the first meeting of the council of foreign ministers on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, had meetings with James Baker, the U.S. Secretary of State, and some other politicians.

Actually, there were two meetings with James Baker. The first one had been planned before and was followed by a press conference, and the second one, which lasted a quarter of an hour, took place on the morning of Bessmertnykh's last day in Berlin at Baker's request. Bessmerthnykh explained that "a question had arisen which we had failed to solve, but we didn't want to do this by phone."

When asked by the INTERFAX correspondent whether it was true that Baker had given him a message from President Bush to be passed to President Gorbachev, Bessmertnykh replied, "you can put it that way."

"My meeting with the Secretary of State had been planned before," the minister said. When we are together in a place, we always reserve some time for a meeting. Lately we have been particularly eager on such meetings, because we have to speed up our work on START. Our second task is to carry on with our work on the convocation of a peace conference on the Middle East."

As regards START, Bessmertnykh said that there were three purely technical problems that were yet to be solved.

"Whenever any such problems remain unsolved at the end of negotiations, one moves forward by millimetres, or by centimetres at best," said Bessmertnykh.

"Above all, it is the problem of telemetry, namely we will no longer be ciphering information on any new types of ballistic missiles that are being tested. What remains to be done now is a purely technical matter: In what way is the information to be recorded from a missile that has been launched, and what parameters are to be used."

In explaining the Soviet approach to the issue, Bessmertnykh said further on that "we are trying to compare everybody's positions in order to resolve the issue." "I believe it would make sense to solve large-scale technical problems which can be solved at the moment, and leave the finer points to the experts, who will finish the work when the treaty is ready to be signed."

Another problem the Soviet Union is concerned about is, according to Bessmertnykh, is the number of warheads to be taken into account during the reductions. There are missiles which were tested with a certain number of warheads; for example one type of ballistic missile on Soviet nuclear submarines was tested with eight warheads. But, later on, the number of warheads for those type of missiles was for technical reasons reduced to four. All missiles of this type carry the new number of warheads. But the treaty requires that one take account of the number of warheads the missile had when it was being tested. "Now we are trying to come to terms," Besmertnykh went on, "on which number is to be taken into account. We would like to find a solution that would suit both sides."

The third problem, Bessmertnykh said, are the parameters according to which a missile is to be considered new. There is a whole set of parameters: the length of the missile, the size of its first stage, etc. There are two parameters we still have to come to an agreement on.

The main difficulty is to develop a mathematical formula in order to determine the proper ratio, namely what increase in some parameter or other can warrant considering the missile as belonging to a new type.

We have an agreement whereby the treaty has to be signed as a whole. It cannot be signed before all problems have been solved.

Bessmerntykh said, "We are moving by centimetres. The final stage of any negotiations is their most difficult stage: there is nowhere to retreat, there is no time to make any changes, and getting to any compromises is very difficult."

He added that all the problems would be solved within the next few weeks, and the work on START would be completed.

Bessmertnykh was asked whether both sides were willing to finish the work, and, if so, why no deadline had been set. He answered, "Both the Americans and ourselves have a kind of deadline in our heads. This is good in a way, because it has a certain disciplining effect on us. But it has a negative effect as well: when you are short of time, you begin to hurry and can make rash agreements. Therefore we have agreed to work as fast as possible, and that was, you might say, a political decision."

The Americans, he said, had at the very last moment produced some new considerations, which, of course, is holding up the work. "This is not the only reason for the delay, of course, there are other unresolved issues as well."

Bessmertnykh emphasised that neither side was trying to slow down the negotiations. "I got the impression from my conversations with Baker that the American side is also interested in speeding up the process."

This week, a second group of experts is getting together, at a higher level. "I think we shall be able to solve one and a half, and possibly two, of the three problems," said Bessmertnykh. "If we reach agreement on the formula for the solution of the more complicated problems, the remaining problem may be solved in a week."

In assessing the results of his Berlin meetings with Baker, he said, "We have moved ahead about one and a half centimetres on each of the three problems."

On the Middle East issue he said, "We are in permament contact at the moment. The situation is constantly changing, different countries are taking different steps, which have both positive and negative effects."

And, although the convocation of a conference has practically been decided on, there are still a lot of problems, caused above all by the stand taken by Israel. Yitzhay Shamir, for example, has sent a message to President Bush, basically negative in content. "We should have regular meetings with each other in order to work out proper measures to take."

"I am shortly going to have a meeting with some Palestinians in Moscow," said Bessmertnykh. "We are trying to take advantage of one of the opportunities to settle the Middle East crisis."

Northeast Asia

Report on Inspection of DPRK Facilities

SK2506054591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Talk by station military commentator Sergey (Bleskov)]

[Text] The DPRK's decision to open its nuclear facilities to international inspection has been positively accepted by world opinion. Pyongyang insists that U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea be inspected as well.

Wondering just how close such a decision by the DPRK has brought the Korean peninsula to a future free from nuclear weapons, the station military commentator writes the following:

The decision by the leadership of the DPRK to allow an international inspection of its nuclear facilities has paved the way to converting the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

Meantime, Pyongyang hopes that the South Korea will express its willingness to compromise in such important issues as the withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from its territory. Such an attitude as such by Pyongyang is understandable.

Washington knows well that such a compromise is inevitable in the future.

The Japanese paper NIHON KEIZAI reported that Washington had informed, through unofficial channels, the Japanese Government of the fact that it had started studying the possibility of U.S. nuclear weapons in areas outside South Korea.

As a first step, the DPRK called on the United States to confirm the existence of nuclear weapons in South Korea. Nevertheless, this runs counter to U.S. policy of neither confirming nor denying the existence of nuclear weapons.

The White House, however, will find (making an exception of this policy to be in its favor). [Words indistinct] once (?concluded) that there were more than 1,000 nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea.

Richard (Fieldhouse) and William (Art), [word indistinct] specialists believe that there were about [number indistinct] nuclear warheads in South Korea in 1985. Unquestionably, this was enough to make Pyongyang fearful.

The deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea is not only closely tied to the inspection of nuclear facilities in the DPRK, but it is also an old device that applies a brake to South-North talks.

So, I am inclined to expect that (?inspecting nuclear facilities) in the South and North will contribute to removing the nuclear danger on the Korean Peninsula.

The tripartite talks between Seoul, Pyongyang, and Washington that will be held in the future will demonstrate what kind of stand each side will take.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Settlement 'Standstill' Assessed

91UF0879A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Vinogradov under the rubric "Commentator's Column": "To End the Standstill"]

[Text] Commenting on the recent Jakarta meeting on Cambodia, in an editorial article the Malaysian newspaper BUSINESS TIMES wrote: "The inauspicious results of this round are prompting the world community to quit wasting time on attempts to reconcile the egoistic interests of the four sides and organize one fruitless meeting after another." What happened in the Indonesian capital to evoke such a harsh conclusion from the newspaper?

Consultations took place over the course of three days in Jakarta between the four opposing parties which, within the framework of the Supreme National Council (VNS), tried to come to agreement on halting the 12-year armed conflict and establishing peace in the country. However, these attempts ended without result, even though substantial hopes were placed on this meeting in particular. This happened because Khieu Samphan, who headed the delegation of the famous Khmer Rouge, opposed the

new initiatives proposed by Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Cambodia, and supported by Prince Sihanouk and Son Sann—the leaders of the other groups. This refusal by the followers of Pol Pot to support the agreement that had been reached became, as the newspaper JAKARTA POST wrote, the "torpedo" which blew up the peace efforts and sank the opportunity to sign a common document.

The document stipulated, first, increasing the staff of the VNS from 12 to 14 members by granting Sihanouk the position of chairman and Hun Sen the position of his assistant; second, prolonging the cease fire declared on 1 May; third, including in a future constitution of Cambodia a formula for a Convention on Averting the Crime of Genocide and Punishing It. Both Sihanouk and Son Sann agreed with these proposals, in this fashion supporting the position of Phnom Penh for the first time. It was at this point that the Khmer Rouge, accusing their "allies" of betrayal, launched their "torpedo" and obstructed the negotiations.

All attempts by the Indonesian and French parties, who are cochairmen of the International Paris Conference on Cambodia, to help the delegations find a common language ended in failure. In addition, after the delegations left Jakarta, AFP, quoting a broadcast by a Khmer Rouge radio station, reported from Bangkok that the leadership of the Khmer Rouge had given the order to their soldiers to renew "active and consistent combat operations" against the governmental forces. Which, incidentally, they have already done in the region of the city of Pailin. The "unscrupulous maneuvers of Phnom Penh and Hanoi" are being called the reason for the violation of the accord.

And so the world community, following the prompt of the newspaper BUSINESS TIMES, is supposed to halt efforts to settle the Cambodian conflict? Of course not! Both Jakarta and Paris have already reported their intention to conduct the next meetings in the capital of France of an international conference for the development of new approaches to the solution of that problem. One is also reassured by the visit to Indonesia of Yang Shangkun, President of the PRC. During his negotiations with President Suharto they both were in favor of an immediate settlement in Cambodia and of the VNS beginning to act as quickly as possible. As the Jakarta press wrote in conjunction with this, China, which is the sole supplier of arms to the Khmer Rouge, can have a decisive influence on them. In its opinion, efforts to restore peace in Cambodia may be started anew if Beijing will give them the "necessary stimulus."

Whatever else, it is simply necessary to give a "stimulus" to the stalled process of a Cambodia settlement in order to end the "standstill." In addition, it seems that it is not important where it comes from: Paris or Beijing. The only important thing is that it occurs and leads to an end to the war in Cambodia and to the establishment of long-awaited peace.

Cambodian Road to Settlement Remains 'Bumpy'

BK2506090391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Commentary by station commentator Aleksey Kondrashov]

[Text] Another meeting by representatives of the four Cambodian groups today, 24 June, kicks off in Phatthaya, Thailand, within the framework of the Cambodian Supreme National Council [SNC]. Will this round of talks bring any positive results?

Our commentator, Comrade Aleksey Kondrashov, has the following observation to make:

The Phatthaya meeting begins in an optimistic atmosphere. Yesterday, prior to the meeting, the four Cambodian factions stated that they agreed to continue respecting the truce announced since 1 May. There was other heart-warming news, such as the statement made prior to this meeting by Cambodian Prime Minister Comrade Hun Sen in which he agreed as much as 90 percent with the peace plan initiated by Khmer opposition leader Samdech Norodom Sihanouk. This plan, together with the more widely known UN plan on Cambodia, are to be discussed at the current SNC meeting.

Even the Khmer Rouge, judging from what we have learned, have also softened their hard-line attitude toward the negotiations. They have now declared that they would support the cease-fire in the country.

Certainly, these positive moves would not eliminate all the difficulties that are still scattered on the road toward reconciliation within the SNC. One of such difficulties is the question of preventing the genocidal Pol Pot regime from returning to power. This question, in my opinion, is of growing significance even if the Cambodian conflict successfully moves toward settlement. It is surely because of this matter that the Phnom Penh government remains opposed to some points in the UN plan on Cambodia. As a matter of fact, prior to the Phatthaya meeting, Comrade Hun Sen stated that he did not intend to issue an order for the demobilization of the Cambodian army before general elections in the country.

There are also other difficulties on the road toward the Cambodian settlement. I just have mentioned a few of them in order to underline the point that the road toward peace in Cambodia remains very bumpy. However, it is necessary to travel this road to the end, and the Cambodian factions are the ones who have to do so by themselves.

From what we have seen, after 12 consecutive years of confrontation, it must become obvious to all that this conflict can never be solved through military means. For this reason, we would like to express hope that the present meeting within the framework of the SNC will provide an impetus for reconciliation in a spirit acceptable to all factions. As for the agreement to observe the

cease-fire in the country, we also hope that it will not be an agreement on paper only.

PRAVDA Closes Southeast Asian Office

91P50231A

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian for 20 June 1991 Second Edition carries on page 5 a 2,500-word article by foreign correspondent Dmitriy Kosyrev summarizing his experiences and observations after three years spent covering Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines from PRAVDA's Manila office. A one-paragraph editorial introduction notes that PRAVDA is forced to close its Southeast Asian office in Manila because of a shortage of hard currency. The currency shortage is also forcing other newspapers to vacate foreign correspondence offices, causing "whole regions of the world" to go uncovered by the media. Following Kosyrev's departure, only one Soviet television reporter and a TASS office will remain active in Southeast Asia, creating what Kosyrev fears will be a "monopoly" on information.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Progress on RSA Reforms

91UF0878A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent I. Tarutin: "No Way Back"]

[Text] Harare—"Thank God it's over. Let us pray together for our common future"—these are the words with which a member of the South African parliament welcomed the outcome of its stormy week-long debate. The result was the adoption of a decision to abolish the so-called "Registration of the Population Act," in accordance with which the country's inhabitants were compulsorily classified by racial affiliation.

This was the last and most important of the remaining laws in South Africa enshrining discrimination on the basis of skin color. There is hence forward no legislative basis for inequality. The dismantling of the entire ugly edifice of segregation, which began with the roof—with the pettier restrictions—has finally reached the foundations.

Legally, apartheid has been eliminated. Thus from the legal viewpoint the way is open for the creation in South Africa of a democratic society. But may it really be considered as of this moment that the Republic of South Africa has entered a new era?

Theoretically, yes; practically, however, there is hardly anyone who would venture to assert this. Primarily because the black majority is, as before, deprived in practice of political rights and is still sidelined from participation in the running of the state. Its demand for elections based on "one man, one vote" remains unsatisfied. And, consequently, the main factor engendering the bloody and lengthy conflict persists.

A number of other difficulties remains also. All emigres in foreign climes on account of persecution by the regime have not returned home. All political prisoners have not been released. Finally, the violence continues. I would not put these problems, the last one particularly, in the purely technical category. The brutal fratricidal strife in the African townships, which continues to intensify, is capable not only of simply hampering but of undermining the reform process.

Does what has been said mean that the changes are as yet negligible? Incorrect also. Any impartial individual has to acknowledge that the face of Southern Africa has been transformed completely. The pace of the transformations could be disputed, of course, but the depth and radical nature of them cannot be denied. And, then, it was obviously not possible to cut through such a knot of most acute contradictions at a stroke.

Now, I believe, the most complex, crucial, and painful stage is approaching. A new constitution is to be discussed and a switch on the basis thereof to qualitatively different power structures effected. In fact, only then will the process be complete.

The practical proposals and ideas which are being put forward in this respect by the white government, as also that on which the leading antiracist organizations are insisting, should most likely not be analyzed in detail. Positions are changing. But of what I personally am absolutely certain is that success may be secured only on the basis of compromise. Compromise between both whites and blacks and between the blacks themselves, what is more. And it is essential to seek it exclusively by the peaceful path. Hopes of solving anything by force are illusory. The entire tragic South Africa story is evidence of this.

In a word, many difficulties and obscurities lie ahead. But the main thing is that there is no longer any way back. Apartheid is on the way out.

Nelson Mandela Visit to USSR Planned

OW2406085991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Report by diplomatic correspondent Igor Porshnev: "Nelson Mandela To Visit the USSR, Although Date Not Set"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] DP [Diplomatic Panorama] has learned that Nelson Mandela, the deputy chairman of the African National Congress (ANC) may make his first visit to the Soviet Union. After Mandela was released from prison last year, an invitation from Moscow had been issued to him on the part of the Organization for Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa (Russian acronym OSNAA).

"It's certainly the case that the OSNAA sent an invitation to Mandela," said Dmitriy Zavgorodniy, one of the organization's officials. "However, if the ANC leader decides to come to Moscow, there is no doubt that he would not have to depend on our invitation but would be invited by Mikhail Gorbachev and in that case it would be an official visit."

Further information obstained by DP reveals that an invitation from the Soviet president had been transmitted to Mr. Mandela in February of last year and, the following March Eduard Shevardnadze, then minister of foreign affairs, repeated the invitation when he met with Mandela in Windhoek.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs told DP that a visit by Mr. Mandela is certainly in the planning stage but, evidently, it will now have to be postponed for "a third time." The problem lies in determining a suitable time. DP was not able, however, to get clarification regarding reports from several sorces that President Gorbachev sent a "warm letter" to Mandela, which included discussion of a possible date for his visit.

East Europe

New Soviet East Europe Strategy Discussed

Background Discussed

91EP0560A Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 7 Jun 91 p 14

[Commentary by Michael Stuermer: "Vistula, Moldau, and Danube: How the Soviet Union Is Seeking a New Concept of Eastern Europe"]

[Text] The USSR is withdrawing its troops from the Vistula, the Moldau, and the Danube, but its interests there will remain. The Warsaw Pact ended on 31 March 1991 at 2400, and no one shed a tear over it, aside from a few Soviet hardliners. Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are openly and quietly soliciting advice from NATO in Brussels as well as from individual Western governments. The parties to whom these questions are being directed, however, are taking a cautious approach.

This is because the united Germany's membership in NATO was at one time the greatest concession to be gained from the USSR in 1990. Militarily, the status of the area between the Oder and the Elbe is already different from, and less critical than, the rest of Germany. East of that line, caution is recommended. The status of the countries between the Baltic, Adriatic, and Black Seas in terms of security policy is unclear, and will remain a point of controversy in the coming years.

The power struggle in the USSR has provided the critics of the New Thinking, of arms control, and of the withdrawals with a veto. Although they are not returning us to the Cold War, the West cannot help but have feelings of deja vu. During the second half of the 19th century, the issue between the Russians and the rest of Europe was always the Ottoman inheritance and the question of to whose sphere of influence the lands along the Vistula and the lower Danube would belong. This is why the Crimean War was fought, and all the Balkan wars leading up to the great war were variations on this theme. The fact that the First World War was touched off in Sarajevo linked the power struggles of the 19th century with the crises and catastrophes of the 20th century.

The USSR is coming to terms with its losses in Germany, especially since it is receiving more than a consolation prize. In contrast, the three strategic countries between the Soviet border and the West are in a state of suspense. Recently, the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a memorandum that describes a holding position. The fact that this memorandum was published in a not so hidden place is an indication of its objective: to appease the conservatives in their own ranks, to show the East Europeans their limits, and to warn the West. What is at stake here is a policy of balance through economic means: "Under no circumstances can there be a real or potential threat to the military security of the USSR emanating from the East European region. No matter how events in the countries of the region unfold, they must remain free of foreign military bases and armed forces."

Following the inglorious end of the Warsaw Pact, the USSR is seeking bilateral security treaties with its ex-partners. The latter, however, appear to be adverse to the idea. If it were up to them, the United States would offer them security guarantees, and NATO would offer them assistance. However, neither of these things is possible in the real world, neither today nor tomorrow. In the setting of the two-plus-four negotiations, there was something like a tacit agreement that the Soviet withdrawals would not be accompanied by NATO advances. Proof of this can be found through careful study of the two-plus-four treaty and of the speech by negotiator Kvitsinskiy at the beginning of the ratification debate in the Soviet parliament.

The Central Committee is now letting it be known that the USSR intends to ensure "solid and durable positions." The desire of the East Europeans to return to Europe as quickly as possible runs counter to a series of "objective limitations," according to the message from Moscow. They do not want any "witch-hunt" against old friends, they see open financial claims, and they fear territorial claims. The weakness of the East European states, however, lies in their geostrategic location, in the burdens of history, and in their economic misery. The Russians know this too. The Central Committee addressed the critical situation with the coldness of a tax audit: "The development of the Western market is hindered by the underdeveloped infrastructure, technological backwardness, uncompetitive production, and the high level of foreign debt of the East European countries. They can scarcely count on foreign capital investments in the foreseeable future."

However, the weakness of Eastern Europe is the strength of the USSR. Since 1 January 1991, transactions between the old CEMA partners of eastern central Europe and the USSR are no longer performed through simple exchanges and cleared with soft transfer rubles, which over the course of many years have cost the USSR an estimated $5 to $6 billion in subsidized oil and natural gas; instead, payments must be made in hard currency. Both sides wanted it this way.

But the result of this is doubly ominous for the East Europeans. On the one hand, the Soviet markets have largely been lost; declines posted in the first quarter of 1991 have amounted to as much as 90 percent, and massive layoffs are on the horizon. On the other hand, the cost of oil and natural gas has multiplied. The East Europeans are feeling economically weak and politically vulnerable. In this situation, the USSR has let it be known that those states that abstain from a further rapprochement with the West and adopt an attentive and respectful attitude towards the security interests of the USSR will once again encounter friendly—meaning soft—trading conditions in the future. Between 70 and 80 percent of the petroleum and 95 percent of the natural gas comes from the East. The Central Committee: "The question of energy exports to Eastern Europe must be regarded as a very important instrument in our overall strategy in this region." Moscow too has not failed to notice that the relationship toward Germany is ambivalent and that the West is very interested in saving the region from chaos.

The USSR wants to move away from mere crisis management back to an East European concept. What the Soviets are seeking today is not simply a new balance west of its border; it is also a sphere of influence. The East Europeans want out of that sphere. But the Kremlin has the means at its disposal for getting its arguments across. More agreeable living conditions are not the only issue on the Vistula, the Moldau, and the Danube. Also at stake is the question of whether the defining momentum of the 1989-90 revolution will lead to a European order or to another wrestling match over who controls the countries along the Vistula, the Moldau, and the Danube.

In any event, the eastern part of Europe will be the West—or there will be no stability in Europe. Western Europe in integration, Eastern Europe in disintegration, the USSR between a heavy hand and a new shape: If nothing happens, these historical lines of development will clearly collide. The countries of Eastern Europe are too much the victims of their past to master their fate on their own. The West Europeans must understand that their own fate is also at stake there.

Strategy Paper Excerpted

91EP0561A Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 7 Jun 91 p 2

["Excerpts" from a CPSU Central Committee Memorandum; date and title of memorandum not given: "Memorandum on Soviet Strategy in Eastern Europe; 'The Situation Has Become Difficult'"—first paragraph is FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE introduction]

[Text] Some time ago, the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a paper, the publication of which was delayed, on the future attitude of the USSR towards its former allies in Europe. The following are excerpts from it.

The USSR is interested in good-neighborly relations with the states in the region. It is very important that these states pursue a policy of friendship towards us, that they not be a source of anti-Sovietism, that they not play the role of an external catalyst for national separatism and for centrifugal tendencies in the USSR, that they not act as fellow travelers with the policy of the forces that have not abandoned plans to restructure the political map of Europe.

Under no circumstances can there be a real or potential threat to the military security of the USSR emanating from the East European region. No matter how events in the countries of the region unfold, they must remain free of foreign military bases and armed forces.

The withdrawal of the Soviet Armed Forces from the countries of Eastern Europe for its part must be carried out with utmost consideration for the interests of the members of the Soviet Army.

Both the existing and the potential interparty relations of the CPSU are of major importance in ensuring the interests of the USSR in Eastern Europe. Besides the traditional relations with the leftist-oriented forces in the region, it is expedient that relations with other parties in the democratic spectrum be established on a systematic basis, with due regard for their role and their influence in sociopolitical life.

Witch-Hunt Halted

In contacts with the new leadership of the countries of Eastern Europe, attention should be given to the unacceptability of a continuation of the witch-hunt that has been unleashed against former leaders, communists, and employees of legal protection organizations in these countries.

The newness of the situation and the turbulent nature of the changes mean that there is an urgent need for a new understanding of our interests, goals, and overall strategy in Eastern Europe. Whether we will succeed in establishing relations with the countries of the region that ensure solid and durable positions for the USSR depends largely on our policy and on a timely, thought-out reaction to the processes taking place here.

Over the past two years, this region has unjustifiably been pushed to the background in our system of international priorities. As a result, the previous model of relations between the USSR and the East European

countries has broken down, and the old system has not been replaced by a new one.

During the current complicated and responsibility-laden time period, when the foundations of future mutual relations are being laid, Soviet policy in Eastern Europe is acting without a precise strategic concept, without a clear definition of goals. Against the background of active advances by the West into this region, this is interpreted by us as a loss of interests, as a withdrawal by the USSR, uninfluenced by rational explanations from the former community, without consideration for the enormous material and intellectual investments made by us.

There is no doubt that the far-reaching transformations in Eastern Europe are bringing with them a serious change in the position and role that Eastern Europe previously played for the USSR. Nevertheless, this region must remain one of the most important priorities of Soviet policy because of its proximity to us in geopolitical, historical-political, and ethnocultural terms, even though the situation has become extremely difficult for us.

One significant threat to our mutual relations has to do with authoritarian and nationalistic tendencies, which are emerging here as a real menace. If in the past perestroyka was understood in these countries as a factor that helped them to reform their regimes democratically, the governing circles now are not even refraining from interfering in the internal affairs of the USSR, and are acting in conjunction with those people who are questioning the socialist perspective in our country and the existence of the USSR as a unified state.

The Role of Germany

The East European countries are sounding out the prospects of establishing close ties with the EC and other pan-European institutions, of cooperation with NATO and the Western European Union. Obviously, the effort to gain Germany's favor is primarily economic in nature.

The advancement of property and financial claims against us can lead to complications in bilateral relations. In addition, in the event of an unfavorable development of events in the countries of this region, the possibility that territorial claims will be raised by them against the USSR cannot be ruled out for the future.

It is necessary to act against the accession of our former allies to other military blocs and groups, especially NATO (and in the future possibly the Western European Union as well), as well as against involvement in agreements that could lead to the stationing of foreign armed forces on their territory.

This objective can be promoted by the pragmatic policy of a balance of interests with regard to the countries of Eastern Europe; this policy shows them the advantages of cooperation with the USSR and requires that they pursue their own line, with adequate consideration for our needs and concerns. This type of policy requires firmness in defending Soviet interests, with a renunciation of attempts to dominate and with an understanding of the essential difference between interference, which we reject, and the use of legitimate levers of influence. Even today, despite the limitations on our opportunities, Soviet policy in Eastern Europe has at its disposal a certain amount of maneuvering room for realizing our tasks.

Energy as Instrument

The countries of Eastern Europe have a critical interest in the energy supply from the USSR (70 to 80 percent of the petroleum demand and 95 to 100 percent of the natural gas demand are supplied by Soviet sources) as well as in many deliveries of raw materials. Weakening this link by blocking Soviet deliveries is not in our interest. The question of energy exports to Eastern Europe must be regarded as a very important instrument in our overall strategy in this region.

With time, fears felt by the countries of Eastern Europe towards the united Germany could also grow in importance. One known factor, although it does not necessarily work to our benefit, is the current line of the Western powers, who regard the situation of instability and, even more so, the situation of political chaos in the region as dangerous.

Of fundamental importance is the systematic coordination of activities between the central and republican authorities in terms of their relations with the East European countries. Without a coordination center, it is difficult to maintain the political course that guarantees the interests of the USSR.

Comment on Strategy

91P20386A Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 7 Jun 91 p 1

[Article by W.A.: "Moscow Seeks To Assure Strong Position in East Europe; 'Legitimate Use of Influence Leverage;' Strategy Paper of CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Frankfurt—The Soviet Union is seeking to assure itself of "stable and consistent" positions in the territory of its former alliance and, if necessary, to show "firmness" in the defense of its interests. This goal was laid down by the party leadership under Secretary General Gorbachev following recommendations of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee. In a memorandum, the contents of which have been revealed in detail after several months of delay, the current lack of a "precise strategic concept" on the part of the Kremlin with respect to its former allies was decried and the blame tacitly laid on the former foreign minister, Shevardnadze, who resigned last December after warning of the danger of a Soviet return to dictatorship. "Over the past two years," the paper states, "this [European] region has been unjustifiably thrust into the background in the

system of our international priorities." In light of the "active penetration by the West," this has led to a "loss for Soviet interests."

While the document, drawn up in the International Department of the Central Committee under the direction of its chief, Falin, expressly states Moscow's renunciation of "efforts to dominate" and to intervene directly into the affairs of the countries of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union does not want to renounce its right to "legitimate use of the levers of influence." Instead, it would employ the issue of future energy deliveries to the region as a "very important instrument" of its overall strategy. Under no circumstances could dangers to the military security of the Soviet Union emanate from these countries, it was stated, in connection with the intention of opposing vigorously any entry of their former allies into NATO or the West European Union. Falin's department, which is said to have regained its strong influence upon the course of Soviet foreign policy since Shevernadze's resignation, recommends for the maintenance of old bonds a network of "qualitatively new bilateral agreements" which have, in the meantime, become the object of intensive negotiations. An agreement already concluded between Moscow and Bucharest also calls for a continuation of military cooperation, something rejected by the other former Pact countries.

On the other hand, Moscow perceives as a "real threat" the fact that "authoritarian and nationalistic tendencies" are making themselves felt in these countries. Making allusion to the strivings of several Soviet republics to achieve independence, certain "government circles" in the formerly allied countries, not otherwise characterized, are accused of making common cause with "those among us who would call into question the socialist point of view and the existence of the USSR as a unitary state."

Commentary on Anticommunism in East Europe

PM2506091591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Commentary by Captain S. Sidorov under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "The Warning Provided by the Experience of Eastern Europe"]

[Text] The transformations in the East European countries, which were prompted to a certain extent by perestroyka in the Soviet Union, are taking their own course virtually independently of us. Furthermore, the governments of some of our neighbors embarked earlier than the Soviet Union on resolving a number of important problems, showing not only a diversity of practical approaches but also common features, some of them negative. And since both we and our former military allies and partners from the Warsaw Pact have chosen in principle the same direction of movement—toward the world economy and a modern rule-of-law society—I think that we should take a closer look at the negative aspects of the reform process, so as to avoid a repetition of other people's mistakes and not to deviate from the goal.

So as not to attempt the impossible, I shall mention merely some of the trends noted by observers in the East European countries and elsewhere.

One area of "common ground" is the attempt by the opposing political forces to exploit **historical nostalgia** in their own interests. Each side, of course, focuses on "its" particular segment of history. For the left-wing forces in Hungary, for example, there is growing nostalgia for the "Kadar era." The reasons for this phenomenon, in the opinion of MAGYAR HIRLAP, are mainly economic: the broad disillusionment and discontent with the changes of the past 18-24 months. In the first place, the working masses, plunged into the abyss of the market economy, are pining for the low prices, accessible services, and reliability of employment that they used to know. Second, this nostalgia is promoted by the rise in crime and, as the newspaper writes, the "hysteria in parliament and the gutter press." I stress that this is taking place in a country reckoned today to be the most successful in implementing economic reforms.

The extreme left-wing parties would be wrong, the newspaper believes, if they tried to exploit the **growing difficulties accompanying the move toward the market** to create a mass movement. Indeed, it would be dangerous for the left throughout the region—not just in Hungary—to "exploit" this aggravation and to criticize governments which are trying to improve the national economy. Such a line could prove counterproductive. In response, the charge will be leveled at all left-wingers that their policy was the true cause of the crisis. In such conditions it is greatly preferable to play the part of the constructive opposition, which, however, must not be toothless but must resolutely defend working people's interests—where they are in danger of being infringed. Otherwise a politicoeconomic process such as privatization may not just prove to be the replacement of one form of social polarization by another whereby the rich get richer and the poor poorer, but could also lead to the destabilization of international relations. As the Prague club the "League of Freethinkers of Czechoslovakia" has stated, already "the Sudeten revanchists are raising their voices to demand that the CSFR Government allow them to return to Czechoslovakia and to reclaim their old property... which is contrary to the past."

But mistakes are being made not only by the left. In Hungary the new political elite is countering the "grassroots" nostalgia for Kadar's times by "fostering" a nostalgia for the Horthy system, which, in the words of one Hungarian journalist, is even more senseless than nostalgia for Kadar and is a historical nonsense.

The **arbitrary incursion into the sphere of history** sometimes assumes quite absurd forms. After removing the Soviet tank from its pedestal in the Prague district of Smichov, Czechoslovak legislators voted by a majority

to adopt an act which states that the Soviet Army... did not liberate Prague and therefore the liberation holiday is to be switched from May 9—the day in 1945 when our tankmen smashed their way into Prague with heavy losses—to May 8. To cap it all, the period of over 40 years from 25 February 1948 to 17 November [1989], "when the country was governed on the basis of Communist ideology," has effectively been outlawed by another legislative act... No further comment is needed here.

In the main, the changes in Eastern Europe are following an ostensibly democratic path. At the same time, the **dangerous relapses into anticommunism** allowed to occur by the new regimes may aggravate an already complex social situation. For example, the Polish Center Alliance is preparing a draft "Law on the Decommunization of the State." The purpose of the new legal act, according to the weekly CENTRUM, is to prevent representatives of left-wing parties from gaining access to jobs in state administration organs at all levels, as well as in the army and police. Essentially a "witch hunt" is being prepared in Poland. It is proposed to "expose the small group of Poles who used to be called the rulers of People's Poland, to expose as precisely as possible the former party leaders at the two top levels of the Polish United Workers Party, the United Peasant Party, and the Democratic Party, workers in the party apparatus and their fellow travelers—staffers of the security service and special departments of the civilian militia, the former ministers and state functionaries, the nomenklatura, the generals appointed in Moscow, the top judges and prosecutors." One is tempted to add: And so on...

That "decommunization" pursues far broader aims than the Center Alliance draft proclaims—the search for "former" officials—is not in doubt. For all their outward adherence to the law, the new authorities do not hide their intention of keeping the renewed political organizations of a socialist inclination "under surveillance" and use every available means to relegate them to the margins of social life.

How far this corresponds to the concept of democracy itself is a rhetorical question. The danger is that in a number of East European countries **one form of totalitarian rule may be replaced by the same totalitarianism** only in a different guise. According to information in the Czechoslovak press, as a result of the "Velvet Revolution," in which hundreds of thousands of CSFR citizens participated, all power in the country is in the hands of a dozen or so family clans. In the recent past, DER SPIEGEL writes, totalitarianism was represented by a group of leading functionaries of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Of course, they were bound to have the security organs at their disposal to protect their privileges and position. But even then, DER SPIEGEL stresses, no one could think that control of the federal Ministry of Interior would be in the hands of a single family—in this case the Ruml clan.

All these are facts from the present-day life of the East European countries which are trying to return to the "bosom of European civilization."

The rebirth of nationalism as a consequence of the bankruptcy of the previous forms of state has a direct bearing not only on countries such as Czechoslovakia or Yugoslavia but on the Soviet Union too. It is hard to say where there is the greatest accumulation of useful experience in overcoming this outmoded, uncivilized, but tenacious form of expression of national interests. Today, perhaps, one thing is clear to everyone: that, in addition to other negative characteristics, national egoism is capable of undermining not only economic ties but also the system of security. A clear example of that is provided by Yugoslavia. The region once known as the powder keg of Europe again threatens to disintegrate into a large number of conflicting "autonomous" states with their own armed forces. An underground army is being formed in Croatia, Slovenia is planning to proclaim its sovereignty on 26 June, and Macedonian nationalists are demanding the withdrawal of Yugoslav People's Army units from the republic's territory. Resurrecting propaganda slogans from the era before World War I, the latter are devising plans for the formation of a Macedonian federation which would include certain regions of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece. Once again, as the Yugoslav newspaper POLITIKA writes, we can see the "syndrome of each one with his own army" without having the economic preconditions for that at all. Do they realize, POLITIKA notes, that a military power vacuum always encourages the military plans of neighboring states?

It is obvious that neither persuasion nor military force—especially not the latter—can resolve problems connected with separatism, and that is also a lesson. There is only one solution—the fundamental improvement of relations, first and foremost economic relations. This idea was again expressed at the recent Prague conference which discussed ways of deepening the European process after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the tumultuous events in Eastern Europe. The just words of President Mitterrand of France, who sponsored the meeting, on the unacceptability of the idea that "the logic of separation should prevail over the logic of reconciliation" applies not only to the formerly conflicting West and East of Europe. They also apply in full to the nationalists in both halves of the continent.

West Europe

Finnish President Koivisto Visits Moscow

Arrives at Airport

LD2406165491 Helsinki Suomen Yleisradio Network in Finnish 1500 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] President Mauno Koivisto has begun an official working visit to the Soviet Union. President Koivisto

will be talking during his two-day visit about trade problems, among other things. Markku Lehto continues from Moscow:

[Lehto] Meeting President Mauno Koivisto in the heat at Vnukovo airport early this afternoon was the second man at the Kremlin, Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev. Beside him for the official reception was Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who took on the job of foreign minister after the popular Eduard Shevardnadze. After the short formal reception ceremony, the Finnish guests were rushed from the airport to the heart of the Soviet state center, the Kremlin. The Lenin highway and Leninskiy Prospekt were decorated with little Finnish and Soviet flags.

At the Kremlin, in its magnificent Hall of St. George, President and Madame Koivisto were received by President Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife Raisa Gorbacheva. Before the tight schedule of the actual working part of the two-day working visit, President Koivisto also went to lay a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier alongside the Kremlin Wall.

This time nothing momentous is expected from Moscow. Consigned to history now, though not long ago, are the days when Finnish delegations would return home from Moscow with smiles on their lips bringing big deals from the giant eastern neighbor. But nevertheless, this visit by President Mauno Koivisto to Moscow is regarded as extremely significant. Trade between Finland and the Soviet Union, for example, has run into quite new and serious problems with the social changes taking place in that country. Bilateral clearing trade, based on goods exchange, was abandoned in the new year, and hard-currency trade was supposed to take its place. But this has not happened to any great extent, thanks to our neighbor's chronic shortage of currency, among other things. President Koivisto, with his delegation, will probably be trying to seek some transition models for getting trade going again, at least in some form. No revolutionary novelty in trade arrangements is surely in the offing, nor will there be a return to the old clearing, but instead small steps, of which one example could be direct exchanges between enterprises.

The delegations began their actual discussions an hour or so ago, and nothing is known yet of the content or results of the consultations. Before that meeting of delegations, President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Koivisto had private talks, and with the content of these talks Gorbachev said he was extremely pleased when talks began between delegations, which are coming to an end just now. The Finnish side seems interested in the bilateral talks with the Soviet leader, particularly in the efforts at reform in the Soviet Union. For regions near the Soviet Union it is significant to know in what direction the land of the Soviets is developing. For that reason the state of the union treaty, vital for holding the country together, is said to be of particular interest to President Mauno Koivisto. The first day of the official visit is to end with a festive dinner at the Kremlin, to which, according to preliminary reports, Russian President Boris Yeltsin is also invited. The Finnish guests would like to meet Yeltsin as part of the official program tomorrow but so far the meeting has not been confirmed

Meets Gorbachev in Kremlin

CM2406232191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russsian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "Soviet-Finnish Talks"

[Text] A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Mauno Koivisto, presidents of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Finland, took place in the Kremlin 24 June.

Welcoming his friend of long standing, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that for the Soviet Union relations with Finland are not simply a part of its foreign policy. They are even more than good neighborliness. They are relations of friendship. Soviet people have firmly formed deep respect and affection for Finland and its people.

Political cooperation between the two states is stable, good, and substantive. That was stated by both presidents. The situation concerning economic links, however, has been causing concern of late. This is a result of the general situation in the Soviet Union and first of all of the state of the Soviet economy.

With unvarying trust in his interlocutor and extreme frankness Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described in detail the processes taking place in the country and their specific features at the present moment. He gave an assessment of decisions now being formed which will be taken in the very near future and which will determine the further progress of perestroyka, the methods for overcoming the period of crisis, and the development of the new federative state. During the conversation Mauno Koivisto asked questions, thereby showing profound understanding of the essence of the ongoing events; commented on the Soviet president's thoughts; and in his characteristically tactful manner shared his own reflections.

Both presidents proceed from the fact that the current visit should introduce clarity into the search for solutions to particularly difficult issues of bilateral economic cooperation, and sanction at the summit level further work by representatives of both governments on the implementation of proposals and initiatives which they have mapped out.

In concrete terms special attention was paid to the ecological projects regarding the "Pechenga-Nikel" concern, the participation of Finnish firms in conversion in the Leningrad zone, and the issue of Finland's economic links with those republics that will not sign the union treaty.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Mauno Koivisto discussed certain issues of the Helsinki process that require special attention, with due consideration for the first session of

the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of Europe, the United States, and Canada which has just ended in Berlin, and placing emphasis on the importance of forming new institutions of European-wide security.

The long tete-a-tete conversation continued as talks by delegations. The ministers of foreign affairs reported on the work they had done in the previous hours. They had discussed the reciprocal trade situation, the problem of combining regional integration, and the all-European process, and in so doing had given a positive assessment of the role of neutrality in the new stage of this process, too. They exchanged opinions on ecological problems, including multilateral cooperation in the Artic. They agreed on reciprocal visits and systematic consultations, especially on the threshold of Helsinki-2. The presidents approved the ministers' accord on stepping up their contacts and noted with satisfaction the high degree of mutual understanding between them.

A briefing was given by Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, first deputy USSR prime minister and chairman of the Soviet-Finnish commission on economic cooperation, about the progress in implementing accords reached during his visit to Finland at the beginning of June.

A package of mutually beneficial proposals and initiatives has been drawn up, implementation of which would make it possible to establish reciprocal settlement of accounts, to work toward extinguishing the debts which have formed, and to bring into play all forms of back-up for trade and economic exchange, including credits. Overall, this produces a kind of transitional period for the straightening out of the situation in Soviet-Finnish economic cooperation.

The presidents expressed confidence that by drawing on firm mutual trust and the tried and tested mechanisms of political cooperation, the difficulties that have arisen in economic ties can and should be overcome to mutual interest. But skillful direction will be required, as will endurance, patience, and the readiness to met one's neighbor halfway even at a moment which is difficult for oneself—something particularly needed on the Soviet side.

The meeting took place in an atmosphere of goodwill, lofty respect, and mutual understanding, which is characteristic of the relations between the two countries and peoples.

Taking part in the expanded talks were: A.A. Bessmertnykh, V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, K.F. Katushev, V.K. Tubylov, A.S. Chernyayev, V.N. Ignatenko, Yu.Ye. Fokin, B.I. Aristov, D.Ya. Penzin, P. Vaeyrynen, J. Kalela, H. Talvitie, A. Karhilo, J. Blomberg, L. Fagernaes, and H. Helenius.

Further on Talks

LD2406185491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with Mauno Koivisto in the Kremlin today. Welcoming his friend of long standing, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet people have formed deep respect and affection for Finland and the Finnish people. Political cooperation between the two states is stable, good, and substantive. This was stated by both presidents. The situation with regard to economic links, however, has been causing concern of late. This is a result of the general situation in the Soviet Union, and first of all, of the state of the Soviet economy. With firm trust in his interlocutor and extreme frankness, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described in detail the processes taking place in the country and their specific features at the present moment.

During the conversation Mauno Koivisto asked some questions, thereby showing profound understanding of the essence of the ongoing events; he also commented on the Soviet president's thoughts in a delicate manner peculiar to him and shared his own reflections. Both presidents proceed from the fact that the current visit should bring clarity in a search for solutions to particularly difficult issues of bilateral economic cooperation. In the concrete aspect, special attention was paid to the ecological projects regarding the (Pechanga-Nikel) concern, the participation of Finnish firms in conversion in the Leningrad zone, and the issue of Finland's economic links with those republics that will not sign the Union treaty.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Mauno Koivisto discussed certain issues of the Helsinki process that required special attention.

Gorbachev 24 June Dinner Speech

CM2506084391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by President Gorbachev at 24 June dinner in honor of Finnish President Koivisto: "Openness, Trust, Solidarity."]

[Text] A dinner was given 24 June by the USSR president and Raisa Gorbachev in the Great Kremlin Palace, in honor of Mauno Koivisto, president of Finland, and his wife.

On the Soviet side, the dinner was attended by Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife, Gennadiy Yanayev, Anatoliy Lukyanov, Valentin Pavlov, members of the USSR Security Council, and other officials; on the Finnish side, were the officials accompanying the president of Finland on his trip.

M.S. Gorbachev and M. Koivisto spoke at the dinner.

Mikhail Gorbachev's Speech

Esteemed Mr. President! Esteemed Mrs. Koivisto! Ladies and gentlemen, comrades!

I am pleased to welcome the president of Finland to Moscow again. The new Soviet-Finnish summit is taking place at a very important moment of world development and at the same time at a very crucial period of our relations with a friendly neighbor, who is dear to us. We greatly value Soviet-Finnish relations, which are extraordinary in many ways, the high level of trust amassed through the experience of cooperation. Soviet-Finnish relations contain a moral and political value of international importance.

Unfortunately, things have been unfavorable in economic relations recently. And the reason is not somebody's ill will. In the given case it is not even a question of the costs of bureaucracy and mismanagement. The reason is that our country is going through a difficult period of reform. But this in no way means that our attitude toward Finland is also changing.

We highly value the understanding and patience which our Finnish friends and partners are showing. The president himself sets an example. This is especially important now. We have to go through the difficult period together and not allow the structures of unique Soviet-Finnish cooperation, which have withstood the very worst times of the cold war, to begin to be undermined, let alone to crumble.

At present, trends in our society toward calm, agreement, and the resolution of problems in a businesslike manner, in accordance with the principles which lie at the basis of perestroyka, are being strengthened.

The Union treaty, a fundamental document for the new federative state and for its progress as a modern great power in an equal community of other great and small countries, is soon to be concluded.

And I think that we will manage to reduce the transition period and accelerate the overcoming of the crisis. This will also make it possible to restore and enhance Soviet-Finnish economic cooperation and will open up new horizons for it.

It by no means follows from this that one can "wait and see" for the time being. On the contrary, we reckon that in this crucial period too, Finland will be a good partner to us, and that together we will prepare the way toward new boundaries of cooperation.

There are areas in this cooperation that should not be postponed. They include ecology. Here, we need to keep seeking practical solutions, without wasting time.

The European process, in which the Soviet-Finnish factor has always played a prominent role, is gathering pace. The first session of the Council of Foreign Ministers which was established at the Paris summit has just ended in Berlin. Creation of the mechanisms of all-European security and all-European cooperation has begun. This is all the more topical because many people in Europe are seeking a new and worthy place in the overall process that has developed since the ending of the "cold war," seeking not without difficulties and dangerous conflicts.

In these circumstances it is important that previous European structures and organizations, since they are being preserved, should operate taking account of the changes taking place in small, medium- sized, and large states and, of course, in the colossal Euroasian expanse occupied by the Soviet Union.

We noticed the recent NATO Council session in Copenhagen. Judging by its results, it is undergoing changes. It is pleasing to see this since, in the context of the new world policy, it is not only we, the USSR, who should change. NATO has taken another step in the right direction, although we do not regard as productive the ideas of turning NATO into the main structure responsible for all- European security. This, we believe, goes against the Paris Charter.

Only as one entity can Europe move forward in search of new ways for states to live together. The contribution of the major European powers, the United States, and Canada has been recognized by all. However, neither the beginning of the movement toward a new European age, nor its successful continuation can be thinkable without joint, parallel, and individual efforts on the part of medium-size and minor states. Generally they determine the very look of Europe. Their role is original and cannot be replaced. I became convinced of this quite recently when I visited Oslo and Stockholm.

The meeting with the Finnish president gives me another opportunity to speak about the importance which the USSR attaches to its relations with northern Europe—this very important component of the all-European process. Today's talks with Mr. Koivisto, my long-standing friend, will assist, I am certain, in building up its contribution to international politics in the spirit of the Soviet- Finnish Declaration.

In my Nobel Prize lecture I spoke about the meaning and importance of solidarity with the USSR as it follows the paths of difficult historic transformations and about the fact that it is vitally important for the world to understand correctly what is going on in our country. I think that in recent weeks such understanding has become more noticeable, witness the invitation to the USSR president to attend the meeting of the leaders of the Big Seven. If they succeed at the meeting in reaching agreement on specific approaches to the new type of economic cooperation with the USSR, this would be a remarkable milestone in the whole world process.

Dear Mr. Koivisto! Let me assure you once again: Relations with Finland have occupied and continue to occupy an independent and special place in our thoughts and our international policy. And despite the enormous

difficulties at present, we will try to do all we can to preserve everything valuable that we have accumulated over the past decades, to disentangle the knots that have formed, and to persist in preparing a platform for a qualitatively new period in our cooperation.

Our current meeting has confirmed: The cornerstone and the guarantee of the lasting Soviet-Finnish factor is openness, trust, solidarity, and mutual benefit. That is the main result of the talks held. And it inspires optimism.

Mr. President, Mrs. Koivisto, friends—to the prosperity of our friend Finland, to Soviet-Finnish good- neighborliness, and to a new Europe!

Bessmertnykh, Counterpart Discuss Cooperation

LD2506090691 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh met his Finnish counterpart Paavo Vayrynen in Moscow on Monday within the framework of Finnish President Mauno Koivosto's official visit to the Soviet union.

The two ministers discussed the results of the Berlin meeting of CSCE foreign ministers, the European process, its new institutions and preparations for the next European summit in Finland in March, 1992.

The Soviet Union and Finland believe that Helsinki-2 will be a milestone in the construction of a new Europe.

They also discussed bilateral cooperation, including trade, economic and environmental cooperation.

Bessmertnykh invited Vayrynen to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. Vayrynen accepted the invitation with gratitude.

Ministers Meet

LD2406191791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 91

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The long tete-a-tete conversation between Presidents Gorbachev and Koivisto continued as talks by delegations. The ministers of foreign affairs reported on the work they had done in the previous hours. They discussed the situation with mutual trade, and the problem of combining regional integration and the all-European process; they agreed on mutual visits and systematic consultations, especially on the threshold of Helsinki-2. The presidents approved the ministers' accord on stepping up their contacts and noted with satisfaction the high degree of mutual understanding between them.

A report was made by Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister and chairman of the Soviet-Finnish Commission for Economic Cooperation, on the progress of implementing the accords attained during his visit to Finland in early June. A package of mutually beneficial proposals and initiatives was formed; its implementation would make it possible to streamline mutual payments, to advance toward clearing off the debt that has accumulated, and to put to use all forms of insuring trade and economic exchanges, including crediting. On the whole, this creates a certain transitional period for correcting the situation in Soviet-Finnish economic cooperation. The presidents expressed the confidence that, relying on firm mutual trust and well-tried mechanisms of political interaction, the difficulties that have emerged in economic links can and should be overcome.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of the amicability, high respect, and mutual understanding characteristic of relations between the two countries and peoples. [video shows the talks]

Lukyanov Meets With Koivisto

LD2506092991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0817 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 25 Jun (TASS)—Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet met in the Kremlin today with Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, who is in Moscow for an official visit.

The conversation, which was held in a spirit of good will and mutual understanding, confirmed that the development of bilateral good-neighborly relations remains a constant priority in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and Finland. The main thing now is to do everything possible to adapt Soviet-Finnish cooperation to the new realities, while retaining to the maximum degree, and where possible, building on what has been achieved between our countries on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperaion, and Mutual Aid of 1948 and the joint declaration on new thinking in action. Soviet and Finnish parliamentarians can make an important contribution here, keeping up a constant and mutually useful dialogue.

In discussing the situation in Europe the interlocutors called for comprehensive development of the Helsinki process and enhancing the role in it of "a parliamentary dimension" in the interests of cooperation and stability on the continent.

Anatoliy Lukyanov told the president of Finland about the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet to stabilize the situation in the country and provide legislative back-up for the reforms which are being carried out, primarily in the sphere of a transition to market relations in the economy.

Officials accompanying Mauno Koivisto were present at the talks.

Dwindling Finnish Cooperation

OW2506055891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By Mikhail Mayorov, diplomatic correspondent; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Whereas, five years ago, the share of the Soviet Union in Finnish foreign trade was about 25 per cent, it has by now dwindled to 11 per cent. The contraction is still going on. This is the reason why economic relations were the main object discussed at the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of Finland, Maune Koivisto, which has taken place in Moscow today (June 24). President Koivisto is in the Soviet Union on an official visit these days.

I have been told at the Second European Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry that the deterioration of Soviet-Finnish economic relations has above all been caused by the problems the Soviet Union has found itself faced with in creating a market economy. The old trade mechanism has been disrupted. Whereas a new one has only just been started. On top of that, both countries have been using hard currency in their mutual transactions from January 1 of this year, which has also had its negative effect.

As for Soviet oil deliveries to Finland, these have practically remained the same. Whatever reductions there have been have only affected Finnish re-exports of oil, not its internal consumption. And it should also be borne in mind that the Soviet oil exported to Finland is not all delivered via state channels. A certain proportion of it, for example, is delivered by the oil-extracting enterprises of Tyumen Region.

As for political issues, I was given no details at the Ministry and was simply told that they would most likely be discussed by the foreign ministers of both states here in Moscow, and that "everything will depend on what the Finnish side chooses to concentrate on." Some journalists believe, however, that the Finnish leaders may bring up the Karelian issue, suggesting that the Soviet authorities should take measures to facilitate contacts between inhabitants of the border regions of both countries. The Soviet side, the Soviet Foreign Ministry assures, is willing to discuss any political issues, from the Soviet military activities in the Kola Peninsula and Novaya Zemlya which cause concern in Finland to the strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe. It was in Helsinki that the famous conference took place sixteen years ago which started the European process. Today a new conference is being prepared, Helsinki 2.

Gorbachev Message on War Anniversary

PM2406121391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[Message from USSR President Gorbachev to FRG Federal President Weizsaecker and FRG Federal Chancellor Kohl on the 50th aniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War; date not supplied]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr. Richard von Weizsaecker, Federal President of the FRG

His Excellency Mr. Helmut Kohl, Federal Chancellor of the FRG

Esteemed Mr. Federal President,

Esteemed Mr. Federal Chancellor,

It is the 50th anniversary of a tragic event in the history of the Soviet and German peoples and in the fate of European and world civilization. On 22 June 1941 World War II arrived on our soil. By launching aggression the Nazi regime signed its own death warrant, but at the same time condemned Germany to crushing defeat and the German nation to the most grievous sacrifices and to disaster and national ignominy.

The war demanded incredible efforts from the peoples of the Soviet Union and became a truly patriotic war. Soviet people defended the honor and independence of their homeland and, together with the allies, inflicted defeat on the aggressor, liberated themselves, and helped other peoples to liberate themselves from the fascist nightmare.

This momentous battle and the victory in it were paid for with the loss of tens of millions of soldiers and civilians on both sides of the front line. The colossal material damage from that war prolonged the suffering throughout the years of restoration. But it is impossible ever to restore what was lost with every human life cut short or crippled.

On this day we pay our respects to those who accepted death as part of their sacred and rightful cause. We express our sympathy with those in Germany whose nearest and dearest fell victim to that criminal policy.

The postwar generations have increasingly asked themselves the agonizing question: Can peoples who experienced all the horrors of total, ruthless war, who burned with hatred and vengeance and bore inconsolable grief at such losses, ever find a way to come together?

The path to reconciliation required not just time for the wounds to heal. Reals signs were required that changes had occurred in political development rendering anything like Hitler's invasion virtually impossible.

Profound, fundamental changes in the European and world situation were required so that it was possible to speak about the end of the Cold War period in the public

mind and the mutual acceptance of its end by the peoples who had fought each other in that dreadful war.

Both objective processes and the gradual overcoming of the 1941-1945 mentality, and, of course, the end of the Cold War, political realism, and farsightedness made the unification of Germany possible and along with it the start of the historic reconciliation of two great peoples.

The final settlement of questions left over from World War II and firm guarantees that henceforth from German territory will stem only peace and the new kind of interstate relations enshrined in the Soviet-German treaties and agreements, trust on the political and social levels, and the dynamic potential of collaboration tried and tested by the practice of recent years—all this strengthens the prospects for steady Soviet-German partnership. It forms an essential and very large factor in the building of the new Europe in conditions of security, freedom of choice, and economic and social progress.

The Soviet Union firmly and sincerely advocates that relations between our countries and peoples be good-neighborly and friendly and that the Soviet-German factor in European and world politics always be peace-loving and constructive, serving the interests of both the peoples and the establishment of common human values everywhere.

On behalf of the Soviet people I express the hope that the united Germany will act thus.

Let 22 June 1941 always remind the politicians and the peoples of their responsibility to history, the present and the future.

[signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR

Ceremonies in Germany Honor Soviet Dead

LD2206222991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The main burden of the struggle against Hitler's Germany was shouldered by our people. That is indisputable. But what is also unquestionable is that a great role in destroying German fascism was played by the peoples of other countries. On this memorable day, flowers are being laid at the monuments to all those who gave their lives at home and afar so as to enable people to live peacefully.

[Begin reporter Mostovoy report] [video shows a group of VIPs laying wreath and troops marching across Treptow Park] We would like to open our report from Berlin by showing you how, this morning, hundreds of Soviet people, war veterans, the staff of the USSR Embassy, and other Soviet organizations, servicemen of the Western Group of Forces, and representatives of the German public came to Treptow Park to pay tribute to Soviet troops who perished in Berlin right before the great victory day and to lay flowers at the monument and the graves. Hundreds of such graves on German soil were today adorned with flowers, reminding those who are alive that the consequences of this tragic date for our country must never be forgotten. [video shows another wreath-laying ceremony]

Today's wreath-laying ceremony at the monument in the cemetery of Soviet servicemen in Potsdam became one of the main steps on the path toward the genuine reconciliation between the two peoples. Those taking part in the wreath-laying ceremony at the monument were German President Richard von Weizsaecker, Terekhov, USSR ambassador to the FRG, and Colonel General Burlakov, chief commander of the Western Group of Forces. Wreaths were laid at the monument to the Germans who perished in the first and second world wars. [end recording]

Armies Could Set 'Example of Cooperation'

LD2206041691 Berlin ADN in German 0639 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The Soviet Armed Forces and the Bundeswehr can set an example of cooperation and mutual understanding, stated the chief of the USSR Defense Ministry's Information Department, Lieutenant General Valeriy Manilov, in an interview with ADN on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the outbreak of war between Germany and the USSR.

In reply to a question as to his present relationship to the Germans and the Bundeswehr, Manilov said that as a soldier and a general he has great respect for the German people. Even during the most difficult times of the war, the Soviet people did not equate the German people with fascism. Neither the supreme command nor the soldiers hated the Germans as such. That feeling was only true for the enemy who pillaged and murdered in the Soviet Union.

As far as the present is concerned, relations between the armed forces of the two countries could develop in a very varied way, from contacts at the defense ministerial level, between command posts and staff, up to so-called soldier diplomacy. Both the German and the Soviet side need this cooperation. The "knot of contradictions" that formed during the cold war was rather tight. It cannot simply be cut through, as in the case of the famous Gordian Knot. "It has to be unravelled. And this requires the good will of both sides, a striving for mutual understanding and openness."

The general said that mutual respect and trust are also a prerequisite for "seeing that the terrible catastrophe that came to our country half a century ago is not repeated."

Germany's Kohl Favors Economic Aid to USSR

LD2306214991 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 23 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Semenov]

[Text] Bonn June 23 TASS—"Fifty years ago, German troops invaded the Soviet Union. We remember the sufferings, brought to Soviet peoples by the war unleashed by Hitler," Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany said today.

Kohl addressed a meeting organised by the Catholic Church in Jonahhiscreutz.

"Against this background, we can really understand the progress reached in relations with the Soviet Union over the past years," Kohl said.

"During the CSCE summit in Paris in November, we solemnly drew a line under the post-war past. Earlier, the Soviet Union had taken a positive position concerning German unification and recognised Germany's right to determine to what union it should belong," Kohl said.

"In 1994, 50 years after Soviet troops stepped on German soil, the Soviet Union will pull out its army from east Germany," Kohl said.

According to Kohl, stable, just and peaceful European organisation should include democratic states in North America and Soviet peoples. In the coming years, it is necessary to include the Soviet Union in building a future Europe in the political sphere, security, economy and culture.

"We want to help the Soviet Union resolve its problems," Kohl said. He said serious problems demanded patience and tenacity. "In this respect, I resolutely support a policy envisaging active aid aimed for self-assistance."

"I deliberately say self-assistance, as the Soviet Union should implement its decisions concerning reforms, and we, from the outside, can boost them and render assistance within our opportunities," Kohl said.

"I am sure that President Gorbachev intends to continue his policy of new thinking and foreign political course aimed for cooperation. I am convinced that he understands that there is no way back," Kohl said.

Bessmertnykh on European Security, Baltics

AU2406121991 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 22-23 Jun 91 p 8

["Exclusive" interview for BERLINER ZEITUNG with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh "immediately after the end of the CSCE foreign ministers meeting in Berlin" by NOVOSTI correspondents Vladimir Simonov and Vladimir Markov: "The Objective Is a Uniform Europe"]

[Text] [NOVOSTI] At the first meeting of the European foreign ministers council, differences in the approach toward the relationship between the new pan-European structures and NATO became evident. Is a new confrontation imminent?

[Bessmertnykh] I do not think that there is now the danger of a new confrontation because we are in the first stage of considerations about the shaping of the new Europe. For the time being, the NATO states are trying to present the matter as if this alliance were the cornerstone of security. In general, one can also agree to this if it is only applied to the respective Western European countries. But, first of all, NATO cannot be the basis for the security of all of Europe. Second, it cannot lay claim to an eternal existence.

This does not mean that we will get into a conflict with NATO in an instant and that we do not recognize it. But we do not believe we have entered a transitional stage in which the existence of NATO, as well as of other European institutions, is unavoidable. We must strive for the development of a pan-European security system. In our view, the development of a treaty on pan-European security should be started in the near future.

[NOVOSTI] How do you envisage the contents of such a treaty?

[Bessmertnykh] Frankly speaking, now I neither want to anticipate the concrete strategic or tactical contents of a possible treaty. At any rate, the basis of its concept should be that a situation with zones of different security must not develop in Europe. There is still this danger because of existing institutions. This must change. Just like economic affluence in Europe, the situation must be balanced.

Now that the borders of the cold war, which have existed for decades, are being eliminated, one has to be careful to prevent the development of borders of affluence. There must not be any borders in this region, not even those that divide Europe into parts that can use the scientific-technological achievements and parts that do not have any access to them.

[NOVOSTI] The foreign ministers of the three Baltic Republics were only invited to the Berlin conference as guests of foreign delegations. How can this problem be solved in the future?

[Bessmertnykh] Before the Berlin conference, I addressed a letter to all the foreign ministers of the European part of our country who would have been able to participate. Six representatives of the republics were members of our delegation to the conference.

However, the chiefs of the Baltic foreign ministries preferred to come as guests of foreign delegations. This actually deprived them of the opportunity to participate in the work at the conference, if one does not consider their presence on the public balcony during the opening and the conclusion of the conference. This is, of course, their business. However, the problem is—I want to apologize for this sentence—that many steps of this kind result from ignorance of the law. For the CSCE process as such does not permit subjects of a federation or a confederation to participate in pan-European conferences. In order to avoid such a situation, one must either

clarify one's participation in the USSR or change the CSCE rules. But they will hardly change because Europe is not only a continent of national, but also of many federal and confederal structures. Of course, no federal or confederal state will permit its parts (for example, Swiss cantons, Canadian provinces, and so on) to participate with equal rights in pan-European conferences.

We welcome the efforts of the union republics to make their contribution to the pan-European process. However, this should take place within the framework of the existing legal order. The Baltic Republics can also make a contribution by presenting their own ideas and proposals. In the present stage it would be preferable if they were to cooperate with us, with the Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and other republics.

[NOVOSTI] In view of the discussion on economic problems in Berlin, what can be expected from Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with the leading politicians of the Group of Seven in London?

[Bessmertnykh] Many participants in the Berlin conference said that the problems in the Soviet Union are general processes and that the success of Soviet restructuring is thus a success for all of Europe. If the West supports the positive processes in the USSR, it supports itself and the whole world order.

Apparently, everything is prepared for President Gorbachev's upcoming meeting with the "seven." It seems that the prejudices against his mission in London (meaning the propagated opinion that he will come to "beg for credits"—the editors) have been overcome. Now all have understood: There will be an important talk about the great joint tasks. Our partners in the talk expressed the wish that the Soviet president not only assess the economic events, but also give a survey of the situation in the whole country regarding the transition to market economy.

EC Chairman Delors Has Talks With Pavlov

PM2106132191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk with V.S. Pavlov"]

[Text] On 19 and 20 June V.S. Pavlov had talks with J. Delors, chairman of the EC Commission.

At the guest's request the USSR prime minister briefed him in detail on the implementation of economic reform in our country and on the measures envisaged by the USSR Government anticrisis program to overcome negative phenomena in the Soviet economy. They examined questions of the USSR's relations with the EC within the framework of the development of the all-European process.

Expressing thanks to the Soviet side in connection with the well known decisions of the European council of heads of state and government of the "twelve" in Rome in December 1990 regarding assistance from the EC for the progress of Soviet reforms, V.S. Pavlov noted the importance of practical steps to accelerate the implementation of these decisions and primarily the conclusion of agreements on a program of EC technical aid for the Soviet Union in the transition to the market and on the granting of guarantees for export credits to buy food.

J. Delors stressed the EC interest in the speediest overcoming of difficulties and in the stabilization of the USSR economy on the basis of a single economic space.

The chairman of the EC Commission noted the usefulness of the exchange of opinions which had taken place with a consideration for the forthcoming conference in late June of the heads of state and government of 12 EC countries at which they will examine questions of further relations with the Soviet Union, which will also be the subject of special discussion at the London meeting of the leaders of the "seven."

V.I. Shcherbakov, S.A. Sitaryan, L.A. Volodin, and M. Emerson and Zh.-L. Kadye [last two names as transliterated] took part in the talk.

Delors Meets Cabinet of Ministers

PM2106141991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by political observer Aleksandr Nikitin: "Credits for... Democracy—That Is Most Advantageous Deal for Mankind! EC Chairman Believes"]

[Text] In Moscow on Pushkin Street yesterday I met with... abroad. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers Presidium was receiving a guest—Jacques Delors, chairman of the EC Commission. He has come to our country at the government's invitation. This is not his first visit....

You should have seen the interest with which our union ministers and representatives of the republican governments entered into the dialogue with the guest who, it seemed, concealed no secrets. And although many people expressed views on a wide range of problems, there was also a lot that was specific in these debates. About who had what headaches!

For instance, G. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was perturbed by problems of the all-European "state of health" of the fundamental sciences and at the same time by details like the behavior of countries which disagree with a particular majority decision...

Global avenues like nuclear fusion, high-definition television, and several others have begun to develop more rapidly. As for the problem of the "majority" and the "minority," Jacques Delors noted, it is decided by a vote.

"Consequently power in the community is concentrated by the center?" asked I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR

[Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. "Do the countries belonging to the EC retain their sovereignty?"

In response to this and similar questions Jacques Delors voiced a concept whose thrust he believes to be the overall implementation of sovereignty and not its transfer to anyone. He believes that the EC states do not lose their sovereign rights but on the contrary use them better in the cause of peace and economic cooperation. And they thus increase their strength. That, in the guest's opinion, has been shown by the recent events in the Persian Gulf. The European countries individually cannot be the equal of, for instance, America, or of Japan as it gathers strength.

But perhaps the largest number of questions were about the economy and investments...

"How is a single economic space being created in the West of the continent when each European country has frontiers, customs, and national banks? asked V. Doguzhiyev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

"Only by modern methods," Delors smiled. "Above all economic and financial methods. For that we are creating a unified currency system and a central European bank and unified social and ecological programs. In brief, conditions are ripening for the optimum functioning of regional forces and resources. We have become convinced that the mere 'market' without efforts by our community cannot provide anything of the kind."

The European community has not yet achieved its goals but it is already helping 12 West European countries to renew their lives and push forward tomorrow's horizons. The EC aids many other countries.

"Will aid be rendered to our country?"

To this question of mine, put off the rostrum, Jacques Delors replied:

"Yes, primarily with food."

"One-off aid?"

"No. Our cooperation is aimed for many years ahead. Because we can see that your country has embarked on the path of democratic modernization..."

The debate was interrupted by a joke from Prime Minister Pavlov:

"For god's sake spare the guest! Even though he is from a capitalist country he cannot be exploited like that."

Jacques Delors rushed to a press conference with Soviet and foreign guests held yesterday evening immediately after the summer storm.

Latin America & Caribbean

Defect Claims in Cuban Nuclear Plant Rejected

LD2506032691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] There have appeared reports in the Western media that Cuba's nuclear power plant that is being built by the Soviet Union does not meet the world safety standards. We now bring you the opinions of three specialists on the matter. First, an expert of the Atomic Energy Ministry, Yevgeniy Ignatenko

[Begin Ignatenko recording, in Russian with superimposed translation into English] The nuclear power plant built on Cuba in Juragua is equipped with a protective sheath that can stand up an earth tremor of eight points [scale not specified]. Even an airliner crashing into it won't do it any harm. The nuclear plant is designed so that in the worst of cases, that is, when the reactor zone is destroyed and all the radio activity escapes under the sheath, the way it happened on the American Three Mile Island nuclear plant, the people in direct proximity won't be affected at all.

The Juragua nuclear power plant is not the first project of its type. A similar station has been running for more than 14 years 60 km from Helsinki, Finland. In the opinion of international experts, that plant is one of the best for safety and efficiency. Four power plant units of this type also work in Hungary. According to experts of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, last year two reactors of the four were among the ten safest and most efficient ones in the world. [end recording]

And one more opinion of the Cuban plant from the author of its design Mikhail Rogov:

[Begin Rogov recording in Russian with superimposed translation to English] The Cuban reactor is a separate, specially designed modification which has been created with due account for our achievements in the nuclear power industry made lately. [end recording]

A Cuban engineer, Vladimir Serera, who claimed that the Juragua plant is not safe enough, gave as proof of the claim defects in the structural elements supplied from the Soviet Union. In his opinion, 60 percent of these elements don't meet the quality requirements. A project co-leader, Aleksandr Nichayev, has countered the claim in these words:

[Begin Nichayev recording in Russian with superimposed translation into English] All the equipment supplied to Cuba has been manufactured with due account for the local climate and the seismic situation. As for the defects, there are not 60 percent of the total, but only six. I cannot say there are no certain remarks about the materials and separate structures, but the existing smoothly operating system of control fully rules out the possible low quality of (?assembly). [end recording]

Shenin Rebuts Charge of Cuban 'Calculation'

PM2106111991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report A. Vandenko, member of the editorial board of PIONERSKAYA PRAVDA, under the "Charity" rubric: "'Young Pioneers' Camp Under the Coconut Trees"]

[Text] The first planeload of 137 seriously ill boys and girls from the radiation-contaminated regions of the Ukraine arrived in Havana in March last year. The children had been invited for medical treatment by Fidel Castro personally. Subsequently an agreement was concluded between the Cubans and the Ukrainian Komsomol [Communist Youth League] on implementing the long-term program "Children of Chernobyl."

By decision of the Cuban State Council the young pioneers' camp named for Jose Marti in the town of Tarara, 25 km from Havana, was allocated as a recuperation center for the children. All the reception, housing, catering, leisure, and treatment costs have been borne by the Cubans.

Three meals a day are provided at the camp and a special dairy has been built to make products for the Soviet children. There is a constant supply of fresh fruit, vegetables, and cold drinks to each house. A special medical aid service was created for the Soviet children's arrival and the staff of medical workers has been increased from 120 to 500 people. A family doctor and a nurse are assigned to each house. The next level of medical help is provided by the Havana children's hospitals named for Williams Soler and Juan Manuel Marquez, involving the institute of hematology and immunology, the Ameijeiras Brothers surgical clinic, and other scientific centers. The medical aid service works round the clock and the staff includes a Russian-speaking therapist and nurses. When necessary there are cardiologists, immunologists, urologists, and other specialists on duty.

Recently Fidel Castro received an official delegation from Kiev, which delivered a letter of thanks to the Cuban people from the Ukrainian people signed by the republic's leaders. Tatyana Goncharova, secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee, said at this meeting that the Cuban leader had once more stressed in conversation that his country will never try to make money out of someone else's grief and will not be demanding compensation for the Chernobyl children's treatment. On the contrary, Fidel reiterated that Cuba owes the USSR a debt that can never be repaid and is happy to give aid free of charge.

O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said:

"Last year I visited the Jose Marti young pioneer's camp. I can confirm that we have nothing like it in our country yet. For that reason alone it would be an unpardonable mistake not to take advantage of the help that our Cuban friends are offering us."

[Vandenko] Oleg Semenovich, in your opinion, how much substance is there to the comment that it is not sympathy but a subtle political calculation that is motivating the Cubans?

[Shenin] Someone, clearly, would very much like to introduce ideological differences into the sphere of philanthropy and charity. Political likes and dislikes are a particularly personal matter, and everyone is free to have his own attitude toward the course being pursued by the Cuban leadership, but what grounds do we have for suspecting people of insincerity? Merely asking that question is insulting—you only need to know a little about the Cuban people's temperament to understand that. I was told that after the publication in the party central newspaper GRANMA of the Ukrainian people's letter of thanks people were fired with renewed vigor and are ready to give their all to the children of Chernobyl. Yet you speak of a subtle political calculation... If this really were a grand theatrical gesture, the Cubans would have made do with the first two planeloads: That would have been enough to create the image of philanthropists and humanitarians. Instead of which, as you yourself know, a long-term contract has been concluded between Cuba and the Ukraine. No, let us not slander people. It is better that we thank them...

TASS Cites Castro Interview With NBC

LD2406191191 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By correspondent Yuri Kirilchenko]

[Text] New York June 24 TASS—Parts of an NBC interview with Cuban leader Fidel Castro were shown by the NBC Television Company in the United States on Sunday.

The reporter said his meeting with the Cuban leader, who seldom speaks to U.S. journalists, took place on June 21 at Havana Airport aboard a special plane outfitted for eye surgery belonging to a clinic under the International Public Organisation of Ophthalmologists ORBIs.

Castro was asked about his response to president George Bush's call a month ago for democratic elections and improving the human rights situation in Cuba as a precondition for the resumption of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba.

Castro said he had to disagree with President Bush. "We have an election system of our own, and nearly 97 per cent of eligible voters turn out during our elections. The fact that people in the United States know so little about how our system works is no justification for statements of this kind.

"No more can we agree with letting the U.S. President set conditions for improving our relations because we regard ourselves as an independent and sovereign country."

Castro criticised the U.S. political system. "As far as I know," he said, " less than 50 per cent of U.S. citizens turn out for elections. They prefer fishing or going to the movies to voting.

"A U.S. president is considered elected if more than 20 per cent of the ballots are cast in his favour. Nothing of this kind happens in this country, so I could recommend that Mr. Bush change his system. But I am not doing this. As regards human rights in Cuba, we have no children who beg in the streets, no senior citizens who die homeless, no abandoned people. I also could set preconditions for Mr. Bush, but I do not do this because I have no right to do so".

Castro then addressed the question whether or not anyone can expect that Cubans would continue to support Castro and his communist revolution, since communism was crumbling all over the world.

"This means that we have to adapt anew, readjust all our efforts and all our programmes, "the Cuban leader replied. "We are trying to do this within a minimum time-span. We are working hard. We are overcoming difficulties, and these difficulties could be even greater. Nevertheless, we have immense trust in our people".

Salinas Offers Mexico's Reform Experience

LD2006135391 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 20 June 91

[By correspondent Sergey Gorbunov]

[Text] Mexico City June 20 TASS—Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari said Mexico is interested in consolidating relations with the Soviet Union in various areas. It continues to play an important role in world politics. In an interview to TASS and other Soviet media, the Mexican president emphasised that the main purpose of his forthcoming visit to the USSR is to establish a direct dialogue with President Gorbachev and exchange the experience of transformations which are being implemented in the two countries.

"We are closely following perestroika and glasnost, being aware that these processes are in keeping with the Soviet Union's internal conditions. Transformations are also under way in Mexico. There is modernisation in the economy and politics, in the social area. Therefore political dialogue will be the most important aspect of the forthcoming visit", Carlos Salinas de Gortari said.

The Mexican president is of the opinion that relations between Mexico and the USSR are "on a good level in the political area" and cultural contacts are rapidly developing intensively. At the same time he pointed to the "weakness of economic ties between the two countries" and he expressed the hope that a political dialogue with Soviet leaders will result in specific actions in the area of bilateral cooperation. "Our countries, though, have a long way to go in this area", he said.

Carlos Salinas de Gortari, whose economic programme has brought tangible positive results in recent years, emphasised that he is not inclined to "give advice" as each country has its own special circumstances, historic conditions and main tasks. At the same time he expressed readiness to share the experience of Mexican economic reform which, he said, is aimed at creating "a durable material basis for political transformations in the country."

Economic Talks With Chile Begin

PY2506015691 Santiago Radio Chilena Network in Spanish 1700 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By special correspondent Maria Cristina Prudant from Moscow]

[Text] The Chile-Soviet Union new opportunities for economic cooperation meeting opened this morning in the [name indistinct] center of Moscow with the participation of Chilean Economy Minister Carlos Ominami, 40 Chilean businessmen, and Soviet business representatives.

Carlos Ominami, who opened the business meeting, pointed out that the signing of a cooperation agreement between Chile and the Soviet Union will be the basis for developing bilateral economic relations. Ominami summarized the aspirations of the participants of this meeting in two points, saying:

[Begin Ominami recording] First, with our presence we want to show the interest of President Patricio Aylwin's government in developing all aspects of relations between the two countries within the framework of our international policy to maintain close relations with all countries. Second, we want to promote and support the Chilean business sector in opening new markets and to seek mutually beneficial new business opportunities. [end recording]

Ominami also said that one of the basic aspects of Chile's current economic policy is the aspiration for an international economic and political opening. He added that this policy does not have ideological leanings. Ominami described Chile's economic policy, noting that two aspects have been emphasized: the righting of macroeconomic imbalances and the development of the process of

opening the Chilean economy to the outside world. Ominami also emphasized the confidence of the international financial community in Chile and its economic policy. Ominami concluded at the international commerce center by saying that our country offers clear, stable, transparent, and nondiscriminatory rules for investors.

Soviet Primer Minister Valentin Pavlov sent a message to the participants of the business meeting, emphasizing that this is the first time in almost two decades that a real representative Chilean delegation has arrived in Moscow to discuss concrete moves toward mutually beneficial cooperation with Soviet businessmen. Pavlov also pointed out that the two countries are going through a stage of democratic renewal. He added that the Soviet people are following with interest the dynamic development of the Chilean economy and the strengthening of its international prestige, which are the goals of democratic reformist Patricio Aylwin.

Supreme Soviet

Soyuz Deputies Oppose Draft Union Treaty

LD2406184891 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—At a news conference here today, leaders of the influential parliamentary group Soyuz, which includes about 700 USSR people's deputies, gave a sharply negative evaluation of the draft new union treaty.

Chairman of the group Blokhin said the document "in point of fact is a treaty on the dissolution of our state". He explained that the draft Union treaty envisages the elimination of the USSR as a single federal state. This "is against the will of the people who declared during the all-Union referendum on March 17 for the preservation and strengthening of the USSR," Blokhin said.

"It is clearly seen from the text of the draft treaty that the USSR will be built on a confederative basis, not a federal one," he emphasised.

Blokhin believes that a new Union treaty" "will be a provisional document because it will not be able to stimulate the establishment of accord between republics and in the country as a whole".

Touching upon the criticism of Soyuz leaders by President Mikhail Gorbachev, Blokhin said that the group Soyuz "does not intend to quarrel with Mikhail Gorbachev as a person but criticises him for actions and inadequate situations in the country".

This is why last week "we supported Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's request for additional powers to him for the day-to-day economic management", Blokhin said.

When speaking in the Soviet parliament on June 21, Gorbachev strongly criticised Blokhin and Viktor Alksnis, co-chairman of the group Soyuz, for "destabilising cooperation and interaction between the Supreme Soviet, the Cabinet of Ministers and the president." At the same time Gorbachev emphasised that there was no crisis in his relations with Valentin Pavlov and that the cabinet had his full support.

Asked by TASS about the possibility of implementing the idea, put forward by the Soyuz way back in spring, to convene an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies, with the president to give an account of his performance, Blokhin said that slightly more than 450 signatures had been collected over the past two months. This number of signatures, according to the country's constitution, is enough for the convocation of the congress which includes more than 2,000 deputies.

"However, not to stir up passions, we shall raise the question of convening an extraordinary congress only after we collect not less than 1,000 signatures," the Soyuz leader emphasised.

Predict Pavlov's Downfall

LD2406201991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] The position of the Soyuz group of deputies in the current conditions was the topic of a press conference given by its leaders, USSR people's deputies Chekhoyev, Blokhin, and Tikhonov. In particular, speaking about granting additional powers to USSR Prime Minister Pavlov, it was noted that someone is seeking to reduce Pavlov's statement into a disagreement between himself and the president. The leaders of the Soyuz group foretold for the current prime minister the fate of his predecessor.

The deputies gave a fragmentary commentary on the content of the union treaty, noting that it aims to eliminate the USSR as a united federal state. The fact that republics themselves, according to the document, establish their borders and that central authority defends them is not a stabilizing factor, in the view of the deputies.

Deputies Criticize Privatization Bill

LD2406115191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] As you know, the USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing its work, and here is Olga Vasilenko, our legislative correspondent in the Kremlin. Hello, we are listening to you.

[Vasilenko] Hello. The Union legislature is discussing today, for the umpteenth time, the bill on destatification and privatization of enterprises. And I must say that the beginning of the discussion was not quite straightforward today. Or, in fact, I should rather say that it was quite straightforward in the sense that everything seemed to be going according to a preconsidered plan. Deputy Kryshkin lead a powerful attack by the "Soyuz" group, and he was followed by Chekhoyev, Sukhov, Shevlyuga, Kostishin, and Pupkevich. And it was all the same things, as always: To whom are we selling our workers hands? Everything will be bought up by the mafia! Adopting this law means changing the social structure of our country—what right have we got to do it? Therefore, let us put the bill up for discussion by all of the people and for referendum. Sukhov told the deputies that he had been in Leningrad and could witness that workers neither understand nor accept the idea of destatification and privatization. Neither, according to Leonid Ivanovich, can many deputies understand what they are talking about. Therefore, more and more discussion will be needed until everybody understands.

However, this law is already being adopted in the republics. And the processes in the republics are far ahead of those in the Union legislature. And if the discussion never comes to an end, the republics can easily do without a Union legislature. This was unequivocally put by Aleksey Nikolayevich Boyko, head of the working group for this bill. Another thing pointed out by Boyko was that the lack of understanding of a bill does not exempt the deputies from the duty to work on it.

Irina Aleksandrovna Andreyeva managed to struggle to the microphone through the united ranks of the "Soyuz" group. She called on the deputies to consider the following fact: The discussion of every serious issue begins with hysteria which is always being built up by four or five deputies, and we always waste four or five days because of this. Let us discuss the bill article by article.

Now the article by article discussion has started, and again the stumbling block is whether the privatization of enterprises should be free of charge or not. And the opinions are so radically opposite, that it is very difficult to forecast the outcome of the matter—particularly because there will probably be voting by name. Such was the proposal of one of the deputies.

Speaking honestly, however, there are indeed quite a few issues here. What to do about the uncontrolled privatization which is turning into a powerful wave at the moment? How to protect the privatization process from corrupted elements who are finding common ground with the state apparatus? How to make the working person the true owner and master of his work? Well, all of this is very interesting to listen to, and what is now going on in the Union legislature is extremely significant. That is all for now.

[Announcer] Olga, I agree with your conclusions but I would like to remind Deputy Sukhov, who is referring to a meeting with Leningrad residents, that when Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was visiting that city, and specifically, the plant where the powerful Kirovets tractors are produced, the workers there spoke unanimously in favor of privatization, and not against it.

Well, that is the end of our link-up with the Kremlin.

Supreme Soviet Debates Privatization

LD2506000591

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 1632 GMT on 24 June carries a 22-minute "Parliamentary Diary" report presented by Vladimir Perfilyev. Perfilyev says the USSR Supreme Soviet began this week with a resumption of the debate on the draft law on the basic principles of destatification and privatization of enterprises, which has been presented for a second reading after a break of over two weeks.

Before embarking on article-by-article voting on the bill, Boyko, chairman of the working group, answered questions from deputies. Boyko says the law is aimed at overcoming the monopoly of state ownership because, as Lenin said, any kind of monopoly leads to decay, and there will be a slump if proper measures are not taken. Quoting Lenin again, Boyko points to the danger of alienating the working people from the means of production and the results of their work. His third point is the possibility of foreign investors buying up property, and here the only means of protection is by establishing quotas on both individual foreign investors and the whole of foreign capital on republican territories or throughout the Union.

Perfilyev then presents a few extracts from questions put by deputies. Deputy Kanarovskaya wanted to know how people in the services sector, such as teachers, doctors, and so on, can become private owners and of what, as they are not covered by the law. Boyko says this point is covered in republican legislation, but as far as the Union is concerned it has not been finalized. Deputy (Engver) refers to a point in Article Six about whether servicemen are covered by the clause about members of kollektivs who have been pensioned or have returned to their old jobs. Boyko says yes, servicemen have the same rights as any deputy. Deputy (Chelukhin) wants to know why this law has not been published so people can study it. Deputy Tsykalo believes the law should be called a law on change of ownership. It would appear, he claims, that there has been some confusion over the choice of objective and that privatization has become an end in itself. By adopting this law we would be embarking on an experiment which affects the very interests of each citizen in the country.

Perfilyev goes on: "Among deputies there are great fears that privatization will become some kind of transfer of state ownership exclusively into private hands. And this, of course, affects the development not only of the country's economy, but also the nature of sociopolitical development. Deputy Ligachev, among others, spoke about this."

Ligachev says: "It seems to me that in our society, together with positive changes, there are processes going on of a regeneration of fundamental changes in its basis. Let us take the question of ownership and its transformation, in other words, that which is the subject of the draft law which is being discussed by the Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, I would also like to subscribe to the opinion of one speaker who said we should be talking about a reformation, about a change in state ownership. In my opinion, we have confused it very seriously with such terms as destatification and privatization.

"People are saying privatization is necessary in order to eradicate the alienation of the producer from ownership. It is being asked: Surely private ownership, which is based on the exploitation of hired manpower, brings together the worker and the means of production and makes him the master of both his property and the

results of his labor? In my opinion: No, it does not. On the contrary, it isolates him. At the present moment calls are being heard all the time—and this is perfectly correct—about the consolidation of public forces as one of the most important conditions of extricating the country from the crisis. But, you know, the establishment of private ownership and the emergence of the class of an owner of private property—and this is inevitable—will mean the eventual break-up of society. I am sure that once they have consolidated themselves in the economy they will enter into politics and take up posts in the bodies of power, including in the country's Supreme Soviet. Perestroyka was contemplated not to change the Soviet system, but to reform it and to develop it, and so long as we pursued this course things have gone well. I do not conceal the fact that I have been perplexed and worried by President Gorbachev's latest pronouncements about his new vision of the policy of perestroyka. When he was in Norway he said at a news conference in Oslo that perestroyka is a move away from one system and into another. What does this mean? If it means a repetition of the agonizing path that has been traveled by the developed capitalist countries, then these are quite different guidelines. This is a fundamentally different policy. At the same time we should recall that many socioeconomic problems—and the deputies know this very well—in these countries have been solved in many ways through the plunder of other peoples."

Deputy Desyatov recalls a recent article in IZVESTIYA which said the United Nations had carried out an investigation which revealed the USSR is 160th in the world in the level of its social position. If a worker works well he should be able to share the fruits of his labor, and he who does not want to work should think again. Pupkevich, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, believes privatization will lead to capitalism and he voices anxiety as to what kind of person a capitalist will turn out to be: intelligent, businesslike, and competent, or a lazy, mafioso, get-rich-quick type.

Perfilyev points out that opinions differed widely during the debate and there was particular criticism of those points in the draft which provided for the handing-over of enterprises without compensation. Many deputies reaffirmed that the main objective of the law is to prevent the monopoly of state ownership and the alienation of the worker from the means of production: after all, privatization is already operating in some republics, krays, and oblasts.

Deputy Ivashko says: "While we are arguing, a process is going on which has been symbolically called wildcat privatization. But I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this wildcat privatization is not so much wildcat. It is being conducted at every level of society and public relations. If you look closely you can see that in the system of central state bodies of management an erosion of ownership has been quietly going on relating to certain concerns, associations, joint enterprises, and so on. This process is taking place at the second level on a republican scale. In other words, a republic gets a little bit where it can. This same process occurs at the regional level, at the enterprise level, and finally at the level of the businessman and individual, more energetic people. And meanwhile, we, incidentally, the state, society, that is, the people, get not a single kopeck from all these changes—in quotes, of course. Because all this ownership of the people which is being picked apart by wildcat privatization at the moment is being picked apart absolutely free of charge. Or at least, for some kind of symbolic payment. Because, generally speaking, no one knows even the concept of replacement value. Does one purchase according to balance or residual value, or to put it briefly, who will be able to rake in this property of the people? What can we expect? That we will all be pulled apart? I realize this would be an anti-popular act. I believe this draft law which has been presented, while in the main meeting in its basic directions the changes in the forms of management of state ownership, at the same time suffers from a number of fundamental shortcomings which make it necessary to work further on it over a short period of time. Above all, it is a question of the objective of destatification not being sufficiently clearly defined in the draft, and people do not understand this. This law, in my opinion, stands aloof from all other acts of economic legislation. People need to understand why and with what objective this is necessary."

Perfilyev closes by saying the discussions were heated and there were attempts to curtail the debate, but the Soviet of Nationalities voted against this and it continued. By and large, however, points of understanding coincided on many problems and many deputies are finding a common view. It is to be expected the draft law will eventually be adopted.

Andrey Nikiforov then reports on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet which worked in committees and commissions today. He gives a brief account of the work done in these committees and interviews Diryagin, a deputy from Kaluga, about the draft law on payment for land.

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 24 Jun

LD2406225791

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2126 GMT on 24 June broadcasts its recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin, Moscow, on 24 June.

Boyko discusses various points relating to articles six and nine of the bill. He goes into some detail about aspects of the state property fund and its relation to the privatization bill and workers' rights. He then moves on to article ten and organization of work on the bill. Article 11 on ways and means of destatification had to be re-shaped because of confusion, he says.

At 2132 GMT Lukyanov reminds Boyko that his time is running out, so he goes rapidly through remaining details of the bill. Article 17 on intellectual ownership, article 18 on special means of payment, article 20 on benefits,

article 21 on guarantees, article 22 on information and various other minor points are outlined.

At 2144 GMT Boyko ends his report; Lukyanov invites questions. Deputies then ask various questions from the floor relating to, among other things, the private sector in China, the Cabinet of Ministers' time-scale for discussing the bill, the establishing of quotas, the question of holdings, the procedure for distribution and sale of shares, the property of pensioners, the distribution of state property fund rights to ministries, articles 8 and 9 relating to the program, article 20 on benefits and 21 on guarantees, how people in the services sector, who are among the poorly paid, and military servicemen, can become private owners, measures to prevent the export of property, and the procedure for voting on the bill.

At 2220 GMT the afternoon session opens; Lukyanov is still in the chair.

Deputy Tsykalo is the first to speak. He proposes that the bill should be called the law on change of ownership. It is contrary to social justice; rather than anticipating events, the bill is trying to catch up with what has been going on. The main question is: Who benefits from this bill? We have failed to harmonize the interests of the individual, the state, the enterprise. Millions will be lining up in front of soup kitchens. It will lead to a massive social explosion. I am against this law, because it is defective. It should be arrived at together with the representatives of republican parliaments, he says.

At 2230 GMT Deputy Ternyuk says he cannot accept the bill; the role of the individual is ill-defined; areas of accountability are also ill-defined. What is to be done with those who are not engaged in production: pensioners, students, housewives etc. After all, they paid their taxes. I do not believe that enterprises will work better because people bought shares in them. We should give the workforces the right to dispose of what they produce. De- monopolization will take a long time.

At 2237 GMT Deputy (Lukasov) advocates adoption of the bill. It is part of the anti-crisis program of the government and the republics. There is no need to make it even more detailed. Ways of transferring various types of property can be elaborated further in light of practical experience. Let us move to debating the bill article by article. Let us vote by name.

At 2242 GMT Deputy Ligachev says the foundations of our society are being changed. He describes how the issue has grown and grown. Private property means a different social system. He recalls how leaders such as Schmidt, Trudeau and d'Estaing said that capitalism is incapable of insuring the individual's needs. Privatization will aggravate the situation, he says.

Privatization, he says, may entail difficult consequences for the people; it should be done, if at all, on a collective basis.

At 2252 GMT Deputy Desyatov takes the floor. He makes ironic comments on Ligachev's speech. "Ligachev and Company" are defending the existing system because they want to preserve their privileges, he insists. He goes on to make remarks about individual articles.

At 2259 GMT Deputy Pupkevich says that destatification should be based on leasing, share-holding, etc. Privatization must be introduced gradually. The working class, he says, is practically absent from republican parliaments, and has no say in law-making activities. This law should be discussed nationwide, as it concerns everybody—otherwise it will benefit only the shadow economy, he says.

At 2307 GMT Deputy Denisov says that the law should be adopted, otherwise property will be simply squandered and stolen. The law has three goals: demonopolization, destatification, and social justice. Collective ownership has no future, he says. Social justice is ensured by a variety of forms of ownership, and only the CPSU can be its guarantor.

At 2319 GMT Deputy Yefremov says the law should be adopted. He dwells on the issue of social justice.

At 2328 GMT Deputy Ivashko, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee, says we have been discussing all kinds of economic programs for quite a few months, but in fact nothing changes. People see this law as undermining the basic foundations of this state, he says, whereas we must turn the worker into the master of his work. Destatification is a long and costly process, says Ivashko. The issues of social protection should be given more consideration in the draft. Many people working in the non- productive sphere, he says, are in danger of being the underdogs of the new system. The draft law should be immediately published in the press, says Ivashko—otherwise any televised broadcasts are meaningless, as people do not understand our arguments.

At 2338 GMT Lukyanov proposes first to publish the draft in IZVESTIYA as soon as possible, and second, says that it would be sensible to start article-by-article discussion and voting by name. A vote is taken. Proposal one—adopted. Second proposal—adopted.

At 2348 GMT the recording of the evening sitting begins. Deputies makes procedural remarks. Lukyanov announces that a delegation from the Republic of Cape Verde is present in the hall. Applause. More procedural remarks follow from the floor.

At 2359 GMT Deputy Sukhov insists on continuing debates. More procedural remarks follow.

At 0007 GMT Nishanov takes the floor to refute some allegations made by deputies regarding the Soviet of Nationalities' position on voting. He adds that official positions of republics on privatization should be taken into account, too.

At 0013 GMT Lukyanov asks the Soviet of Nationalities to vote on stopping the debate. It is not adopted.

Lukyanov says that although the Soviet of the Union voted in favor of stopping the debate, the debate should now continue.

At 0015 GMT a deputy takes the floor to make his contribution on privatization. He says that privatization does not mean betrayal of the interests of the people—just the contrary.

At 0023 GMT Deputy Panchenko says that because we have chosen a market economy, we have no other option but to adopt this law on privatization; however, haste is not necessary, and the population should get a clear picture of what to expect in the future.

At 0033 GMT Deputy Mamedov insists on a nationwide discussion of the draft, as it is too controversial and will have a wide-ranging effect on various strata of the population. An anti-monopoly law should be adopted as soon as possible, he says.

At 0039 GMT Deputy Kisilev says the draft should be further elaborated and perfected. Privatization should be carried out only on condition that the labor collective agrees to it.

At 0044 GMT Lukyanov puts ending the debate to the vote. It is adopted. Starting the discussion and voting article-by-article is voted on and adopted.

At 0048 GMT Lukyanov proposes discussing another law, in the meantime, as officials from the Foreign Ministry are here and waiting. Chaplin presents a draft law on the right to take documents out of the USSR. He gives background to existing restrictive practices which effectively forbid Soviet people to take their documents, such as diplomas, etc., abroad, and therefore make their position vulnerable at their new place of residence.

At 0054 GMT a deputy from the corresponding commission proposes amendments to the draft.

At 0056 GMT Lukyanov puts the draft as a whole to the vote. It is adopted: 333 for, 2 against, and 10 abstentions. A vote is taken on enforcing the law from 1 October this year. It is adopted.

At 0059 GMT Lukyanov returns to discussing the privatization draft. He reads Obolenskiy's law on postponing the discussion until all versions are available to deputies. Boyko says that all sensible proposals were taken into account.

At 0101 GMT Deputy Pavlov opens the article-by-article discussion by commenting on the title of the draft. Boyko answers back. Voting on Pavlov's proposal—it is not adopted. More proposals on the title, follow, then voting. A compromise title is adopted.

At 0112 GMT Deputy Engver comments on the preamble.

At 0115 GMT more comments on the wording of the preamble are made. Boyko replies.

At 0127 GMT Article One is discussed. Deputy Pavlov points out to legal contradictions in the use of the terms privatization and destatification. Denisov proposes his amendments to the wording.

At 0137 GMT Lukyanov proposes to take these proposals into account, and to return to voting on Friday.

At 0138 GMT the recording ends.

Preamble to Privatization Law Adopted

LD2506095891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 25 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Union parliament continues its work today. Deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet have begun the second reading of the draft law on destatification and privatization. Critics of the draft law have demanded that it should be submitted to nationwide discussion. However, parliament adopted by a majority the preamble to the draft law and decided to continue its consideration on Friday 28 June.

Resolution Issued on Economic Situation, Budget

CM2506095591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

["On the Socioeconomic and Sociopolitical Situation in the Country."]

[Text] The socioeconomic and sociopolitical situation of the country has not stabilized and remains tense. Although the decline of production has slowed down, the crisis processes in the economy have not been overcome. The supreme bodies of state government of the USSR and of the republics have not yet taken any resolute steps to implement the economic agreement and program, concluded by them, of joint action by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the sovereign republics for bringing the country out of the crisis and especially for normalizing the financial and credit monetary system.

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To take note of the information provided by USSR Prime Minister Comrade Pavlov on the socioeconomic and sociopolitical situation of the country.

2. To draw the attention of the president of the USSR and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to the fact that, despite the constitutional rights which they have and the granting of additional powers to the USSR president, measures to implement USSR laws and the decrees and resolutions of the supreme bodies of state power and government directed toward practical realization of the "main directions of stabilization of the national economy and transition to a market economy" are not being taken in good time or consistently.

3. To recommend that the USSR president examine the specific proposals expressed by USSR people's deputies during their discussion of the socioeconomic and sociopolitical situation in the country, especially regarding the functioning of a unified banking system, the formation of the Union budget, and the 1991 harvest and its safe-keeping, and to inform the USSR Supreme Soviet of the results.

4. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is:

—To present a report to the USSR Supreme Soviet in June on the carrying out of the Union budget and measures enabling the implementation of the USSR law "On the Union Budget for 1991";

—To organize the development of production programs and forecasts of the socioeconomic development of sectors, regions, republics, and the USSR for the year 1992 in conjunction with the governments of the republics;

—To present to the USSR Supreme Soviet by 1 October 1991 an all-Union forecast of the functioning of the country's economy in 1992 and drafts of the state plan regarding the spheres of jurisdiction of the USSR and the Union budget for 1992.

[signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Kremlin, 21 June 1991.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Military Councils

LD2406123391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1137 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 24 Jun (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev signed a decree on 22 June on the approval of regulations on military councils in the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR KGB troops, the USSR MVD Internal Troops, and the Railway Troops, which came into force the moment it was signed. It states in particular that military councils are permanent collegial bodies of military- political leadership in the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR KGB troops, USSR MVD Internal Troops, and the Railway Troops.

Military councils are made up on an ex-officio basis by the commander-in-chief (commander, chief) as chairman of the military council, and the first deputies of the commander-in-chief (commander, chief), the chief of staff and chief of the military- political administration (department), and other officials of the military administration bodies.

The presidents of the republics, chairmen of the republics' supreme soviets or of their presidiums can, with their consent, be appointed to the staff of military councils by the USSR president in accordance with the representations of the Defense Council under the auspices of the USSR president, as can the heads of governments of the republics, the chairmen and deputy chairmen of the kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies and their executive committees on the territory of which the relevant bodies of military adminstration are deployed.

The military councils are responsible to the president of the USSR, the prime minister of the USSR, the minister of defense of the USSR, the chairman of the USSR, KGB, and the USSR minister of MVD for construction, development, training, and vital activity, and for the combat and mobilization readiness of subordinate troops (forces), for the fulfillment of combat tasks by them, for their moral and political condition, military discipline, and for the social and legal protection of the men, and they also evaluate the effectiveness of the work of the bodies of military administration and officials, carry out the selection, deployment, and education of military cadres, and examine questions of conferring military titles and awards.

The military councils cooperate with the bodies of state power and administration, and also with the organizations of political parties, of mass movements and other public associations operating in accordance with legislation with a view to guaranteeing the fulfillment of the tasks facing the troops (forces).

The proposals of military councils are examined according to set legislative procedure by the bodies of state administration to which they are directed. Supervision (kontrol) of the activity of military councils in the USSR Armed Forces is implemented by the minister of defense of the USSR, in the USSR KGB troops by the chairman of the USSR KGB, in the USSR MVD Internal Troops by the USSR minister of MVD, and in the Railway Troops by the USSR defense minister together with the USSR minister of transport construction.

Gorbachev Dismisses Attacks on Policy

OW2406105491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev has said that there are no problems between himself and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and that no crisis occurred in their relationship. Addressing the Supreme Soviet on Friday M. Gorbachev pointed out that all the crucial issues are always discussed together, and that he presides over cabinet sessions designed to consider major problems.

These who profit from the kindling of rumours about a crisis between the President and the Prime Minister are forces seeking to destabilize the situation, M. Gorbachev said. The threat of resignation doesn't worry him, he said. He pays no attention to the endeavours to collect 500 signatures for the purpose of forcing him to resign.

He will go on with the cause that needs to be accomplished, said the president. According to him, such people as Alksnis, Blokhin (leading members of the parliamentary faction "Union": IF [INTERFAX]) and others who engage in provoking clashes in the news media, at plenums held by the CPSU Central Committee and at Supreme Soviet sessions, destabilize the activity of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers.

Answering questions put by some deputies, Mikhail Gorbachev dismissed attacks on his foreign policy. "As long as I am the President, I'll follow a foreign policy aimed at promoting cooperation on the world scene", he said. "We have quickly forgotten that we stood on the brink of nuclear abyss. As a president, I have no right to forget that our economy is overmilitarized, that it neglects the needs of man", M. Gorbachev pointed out. Interaction with the U.S. and with Europe is no capitulation, but endeavours to establish equitable and mutually beneficial ties, he declared. The USSR President denounced the attempts to incite a hysterical campaign for the purpose of sowing discord between political figures. He referred to news media statements that "Boris Yeltsin went to the U.S. to promote cooperation, while Gorbachev intends to go there hat in hand". He qualified such assertions as demagogy and meanness, and stressed that he will stand for constructive cooperation generally.

Commentator Views Gorbachev-Pavlov Dispute

91UN1884A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 21 Jun 91 p 2

[Article by Almira Kozhakhmetova: "President, Parliament, and Premier: Let Us Be Friends!"]

[Text] **The fact that an alienation zone has emerged between the Union parliament, on the one hand, and the president (plus the Council of the Federation), on the other, became clear at the end of April. This was when everybody comprehended the meaning of the joint declaration of the "ten," which speaks of the necessity of electing a new national deputy corps and, naturally, of disbanding the current one. The normal human reaction of many USSR Supreme Soviet members was to take offense: Why had the participants in the first Novo-Ogarevo conference kept it a secret from parliament itself?**

The irritation and discontent have been accumulating, manifesting themselves only in minor splashes in the form of public press statements by parliament members (for instance, the Kogan and Kazantsev discussion published in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA and in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI). However, when USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov stepped up to the parliament podium in the beginning of this week and asked for additional powers for the government, it gave the deputies an opportunity to express themselves frankly.

The substance of the matter is that the head of the Cabinet of Ministers, having informed the Supreme Soviet of the economic and sociopolitical situation in the country, proposed that he be given the power to independently and flexibly decide on the whole number of economic problems, and rather substantial ones at that. To the question from one of the deputies as to whether the president had been informed, the premier said: "No."

Some members of the Supreme Soviet—mostly those belonging to the Soyuz group—reached the following conclusion: The prime minister is obviously distancing himself from the president; this means that the parliament, "upset" with the president, should support V.S. Pavlov and give him the powers he was seeking. Others called the presentations of both the prime minister and the heads of three departments—the defense, the KGB, and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]—an attempt to limit presidential power.

I do not think we have a reason to talk about an attempted "silent coup d'etat" by mutual agreement between parliament and the prime minister. A coup d'etat is a cliche that has become fashionable lately. Most likely, V.S. Pavlov had been driven to desperation by the impossibility to manage normally a semicollapsed national economy—just like anyone else would in his place. It looks like he wants to shake the Union and republic executive structures out of their comatose state, which—until the Union treaty is signed—do not altogether seem to be such structures. Nobody seems to be concerned with the fact that the Union treaty may be close at hand, but it is still in the future, while the work needs to be done now, today. Having his arms and feet tied by the Union republics' reckless sovereignty, the premier nevertheless does not want to accept the role of a "sacrificial lamb." He acts the best he can.

Much more important is the current position of the USSR Supreme Soviet—the organ that is going to ratify the Union treaty. One can dismiss the emotions and the outcry such as: "We have been written off." But how can one dismiss the fact that on 21 May parliament adopted, by a majority vote, a resolution in which it registers its disagreement with some clauses in the Novo-Ogarevo memorandum?

The easiest way to explain parliament's unhappiness is through a primitive but already popular scheme: The deputies do not want new elections because they have very much gotten used to their Moscow apartments and high salaries—thus, the disagreements. Of course, personal motives are present—after all, we are all human. But this "lure" is not the main point. In the back rooms of parliament, one deputy—a Moscow physician who does not need a deputy's apartment and whose profession can provide him with a quite decent salary—frankly told me the reasons for the disagreement. For two years the people who came to work for the Supreme Soviet had shown statesmanship in all their decisions and actions. This did not make them popular. On the contrary, the Union parliament has become an object of pointed criticism for ostensibly being too conservative.

Then one fine day the Council of the Federation, apparently on its own, decided the fate of the supreme legislative organ. In which the latter is asked once again to display its statesmanship. This time... through self-liquidation.

Undoubtedly, the Supreme Soviet and the congress may in principle disagree with the Council of the Federation and the president. Whose interests, however, will the deputies express then? And will it not mean that the country would enter a new phase of a legislative and executive power crisis? Only this time on the highest Union level. Judging by the tone of many deputies who spoke, a compromise is possible. Evidence of that is also in the fact that, after all, parliament did not grant the premier the powers that had not been approved by M.S. Gorbachev.

In a few days the USSR president will present to the parliament the final version of the Union treaty. This will be a good occasion to talk it out and, perhaps, resolve the conflict.

Yakovlev Actions Compared to AIDS Infection

PM2406150391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences Professor Eduard Volodin under the "Continuing the Discussion" rubric: "Adviser in a King's Mantle"]

[Text] *On 7 May 1991 our newspaper published an open letter from G. Zyuganov [member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee] to A.N. Yakovlev, prompted by the latter's statement that "They are very dangerous, the Russian Communist Party apparatus, for instance. And its leadership. They are openly saying that perestroyka has deviated from its course." Following the open letter's publication, the editorial office received a multitude of letters which mainly support its author's stance. "I thank Comrade Zyuganov for his objective and honest article which, I would very much like to hope, will open many people's eyes"—this is what A. Tikhomirov from Elektrostal near Moscow wrote. A. Polyakov, a nonparty person and fitter from Labytnangi City (Tyumen Oblast), not only supports the position expressed in the open letter but also takes the "architect of perestroyka" rigorously to task for the people's impoverishment over the last few years and the headlong restoration of the bourgeois system. "But the decoy ducks of capitalism are vainly striving to eradicate from our minds the very concept of socialism, of the chance to honestly live according to labor and justice," the worker concludes.*

It is impossible to read without emotion and anguish the thoughts expressed by A. Mustafayev from Baku, N. Zaytsev from Astrakhan, N. Kukhtin from Nemchinovka (Moscow Oblast), and many, many other readers concerning the disastrous consequences for the country of the policy pursued by our recent chief ideologist and currently senior adviser to the president. But a series of publications have carried articles sharply criticizing G. Zyuganov. We continue the discussion today.

In our time of total overthrow of authorities, a time not so much of political freedom but of political dissoluteness, when any boorish statements about sociopolitical figures and even the head of state are considered a sign of civic courage, when any twisted individual can raise a poster reading "Gorbachev Is a Fascist," there are nonetheless people who seem to be solidly protected against public criticism by some sort of invisible barrier. This is that much more striking in view of the fact that, by the nature of their past and present activity, they should actually be the first and foremost targets of anticommunism's snipers who have suddenly sprouted all over the place. Let us look at Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, known among people as one of the narrow circle of perestroyka's founder members and described as "trailblazer," "architect," and God knows what else. He himself has never repudiated a single one of these descriptions.

Until very recently, for as long as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo played a central role in the country's political life, A.N. Yakovlev was one of its members and simultaneously secretary of the CPSU Central Committee responsible for the state of ideological work. He had colleagues working in the same sphere—Ye.K. Ligachev and V.A. Medvedev—but they came under such concerted fire from all types of weapons used in political struggle that they had to resign. It is not up to me to pass judgment on them, but they held their positions to the end. Meanwhile A.N. Yakovlev, without suffering even a scratch, without even a single crease on his mantle and cap, calmly abandoned the CPSU corridors of power that were getting too hot for comfort and moved to new and more secluded chambers of power, settling down comfortably without taking on the burden of any specific responsibility for the state of affairs or solution of problems in the country, while retaining broad and even excessive opportunities to influence the country's destiny.

Nowadays even a blind person would notice that the CPSU's chief ideologist is, without any compunction, striving to keep out of the current political struggle and, whenever he does get involved in it, it is only to lash out at his former party comrades. Within the party itself, A.N. Yakovlev's position initially caused bewilderment, followed by annoyance, which in turn was followed by complete and overt rejection. The years-old commitment to discipline tied the tongues and hands of millions of rank and file Communists, even though questions were increasingly often asked in smoking rooms, during lunch breaks, and at meetings: "Where are we really going, brothers?", "Why are our leaders not telling us where they are taking us?", and so on.

Finally, on 7 May, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published an open letter from A. Zyuganov, former subordinate and later associate of A.N. Yakovlev's in party work, addressed to his former chief and entitled "Architect

Amid the Ruins." This was essentially the first serious statement against someone whom society had long ago dubbed "the gray eminence." This article had the same effect as the child's cry of amazement in Andersen's fairy tale: "Look, the king is naked!" I know of the numerous "indignant" telephone calls to the refractory newspaper's editorial office that were organized, I know of the sundry threats that its chief editor received at that time. As far as A.N. Yakovlev is concerned, criticism is an exceptionally powerful allergen and he simply cannot stand its effect. Everyone remembers the sensational quest for the villains who dared to distribute at the 28th party congress a synopsis of A. Yakovlev's conversation with young delegates. And A.N. Yakovlev's article published by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 April openly presented a thesis rejecting personal criticism. It is necessary, he said, to criticize problems rather than individuals. But what should be done if it is individuals who actually create problems every now and then? Is this not an attempt to protect his own back? After all, Zyuganov caustically noted that A. Yakovlev had not made any statement in defense of a single one of his former comrades in the higher echelons of power when they were being publicly fed through the wringer—and on a personal basis at that.

So let glasnost be really multidimensional, let it permeate the atmosphere, rather than being reminiscent of a directed and often destructive energy beam. And then glasnost cannot sweep beneath the carpet a question that is in the mind and on the tongue of almost each and every normal person: "That which is happening in our country—is it the consequence of the leaders' improvidence, shortsightedness, 'blind obedience,' and intellectual and volitional impotence or is it the result of the country and society being deliberately driven to chaos and self-destruction?" The answer to any of these questions, addressed to the architects of perestroyka, would put them in an extremely delicate position. They either will have to admit their incapability before the whole people or—and this would be tantamount to political suicide—will be unable to deny that chaotic confusion was the goal beyond which the trailblazers could see nothing else.

A paradoxical situation has developed. The apparatus of the country's president receives a steady flow of desperate letters and telegrams from all corners of the worn-out country: From individual citizens, from trade union organizations, from oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies (differing in their party orientation), from ethnic minorities, and so on, which contain a powerful cry from the heart and beg that measures be taken to stabilize the situation, and meanwhile the president's closest adviser is stubbornly and unperturbably repeating that everything is developing the way it should. With all the good will in the world, it is impossible to avoid comparison with the well-known ditty: "Everything is fine, your ladyship, but for a few trivial matters..." God forbid that the creators of the present course should organize a nationwide referendum asking: "Are you satisfied with the course and results of perestroyka?" They would be terrified by the people's appraisal of their deeds.

True enough, they do seem to be getting somewhat scared. There is no sight of any light at the end of the tunnel in which they have driven this vast country and this great people, and timidity has started getting hold of newly-hatched trailblazers. Evidence of this can be seem in the selfsame article carried by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 April 1991. You read it and you can really sense that the author's knees are beginning to shake. This is probably like the icy grip experienced by those who started the Chernobyl experiment, which ended in disaster, when they saw the first signs of the reactor running out of control.

Yakovlev—still in the grips of inertia—describes the changes which were launched in our country after 1985 as the first nonviolent revolution, forgetting that all genuine revolutions were prepared both ideologically and politically in advance, sometime over a period of decades. The French Enlightenment figures paved the way for the Great French Revolution, the Marxists paved the way for the October Revolution. The perestroyka processes which were launched in our country were not prepared in any way. The initiators of changes felt—just like the whole people did, as a matter of fact—that it was impossible to carry on living like that, that a phase of stagnation had set in. But this feeling alone is not enough to elaborate a considered perestroyka policy. This probably needed a certain period of time, maybe consultation with the people. "Measure seven times before you cut," the folk wisdom demands. "Look before you leap," another proverb warns. A revolution—especially a nonviolent one— must be very thoroughly prepared. The makers of the new policy not only should have had a clear idea of the paths, byways, and ultimate goals they were choosing, but also should have taken their ideas to the people, informed everyone of this perestroyka program, and persuaded the collective mind that there was no alternative. Look no further than A.N. Yakovlev's laments: "In practice the potential of organized resistance by the economic and state apparatus was not realistically taken into account...", "The policy of renewal was insufficiently prepared for this, both objectively and subjectively; it came up against this without the necessary reserves and organizational backup", "Looking back, you can see especially clearly the qualitative losses which perestroyka is currently sustaining as a result of the fact that the ground was essentially not prepared for as painless a transition to the market as possible. It was not prepared organizationally, economically, and even politically." Translating these sentences into normal human language, A.N. Yakovlev should have said: "We had no idea what we were starting!", but instead he repeats: "Everything is fine, your ladyship..."

And so it happened that, instead of a "nonviolent revolution," the 300-million strong people became guinea pigs in yet another experiment which obviously

got out of its organizers' control and is perfectly obviously threatening to bring them down. What is the real value of advisers who have brought the prestige of the country's president to its nadir, and have led his policy (or the policy identified with him) into a blind alley? Actually, they have led him to the brink of a far from honorable retirement from the post he holds. Is there any other country which would keep in an office of state an "eminence" who makes, for example, the following forecasts concerning the development of the situation in the country: "I expect that the processes of renewal will continue developing, but it will not be easy or straightforward. It will be necessary to overcome resistance, and there will be individual mistakes and crises, but they will continue developing." That sort of adage could come from any old fortune cookie. The cookie does not define its personal participation in the development of events or the role of other makers of the social process. "The processes... will continue developing, but it will not be easy or straightforward..."

Back in the late 1980s, when A.N. Yakovlev accomplished the "dizzying leap" from behind the desk of director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute into the seat of chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, soon to be followed by membership of the Politburo and appointment as secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, he got down to elaborating the CPSU's world philosophy in the hew historical conditions in his capacity as Chief Ideologist. A task which, putting it bluntly, is far from simple in view of the changed world, the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, and the pressing problems within our country and our ruling party. A.N. Yakovlev got down to his new job with special keenness, taking on the deideologization of ideology. Simplistic insinuations started rather quietly getting implanted in the public's mind: Abuses by Stalin's dictatorial regime started getting identified with socialism as a concept of social development; dekulakization, mass repressions, and intolerance toward dissidence were presented as congenital features of socialism. It is impossible to forget that the socialist teaching came to us from Europe, and the social-democratic branch over there is to this day enviably growing and flourishing in a series of countries not only as a teaching but also as state practice.

Unbelievable, but nonetheless a fact! Instead of renewing and developing the socialist teaching, the CPSU Central Committee ideological apparatus took a course of defaming, discrediting, and eliminating it. The group of "scientists" and "public figures", who either sold themselves or hired out their services, immediately produced dodgers who figured out on which side the bread was buttered and started deepening and developing new and secret directives. There is no newsprint in the country, there is no paper to print textbooks, children's books are being deleted from catalogs, the journal NOVYY MIR is on its deathbed but, with A.N. Yakovlev's blessings and at times even with his direct assistance, we are seeing the proliferation—like of sheldrakes on a rotting beam—of rags and news sheets, of one-day and one-week wonders in which rumor replaces hard facts, malice replaces common sense, and cynicism replaces elementary probity. Their main, and perhaps their only common feature is anticommunism in varying doses. He himself became a founder member of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, whose political line needs no introduction. The only time A.N. Yakovlev took warning was perhaps the occasion when the newspaper he helped to found published a collective letter demanding the USSR president's resignation (he simply failed to sign the letter, but did not utter a word to condemn its contents).

A similar new line was applied in cadre selection. He did not let this sector of work slip from his attention for even a moment. The team of "Yakovlev men" is not numerically strong but it has penetrated the main mass media, expanding the scale of society's antisocialist poisoning and its deideologization. This is why A.N. Yakovlev is so diligently bypassed by public criticism, this is why VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA proclaims him to be "one of our brilliant intellects." "You scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours."

For as long as mankind lives in society, it will without fail have its social conscience, its own set of values, and its own target directives. This means having its own ideology. Hardly anyone would take it upon himself to claim that Islam is not an ideology or that social democracy is not an ideology. The same can also be said about Christian democracy and national-democratic ideologies. And yet, we alone were offered a deideologized vacuum as the preferred path. Deliberately destroying the entire historical legacy (the way his predecessors used dynamite to blow up churches), what A.N. Yakovlev did was like injecting an AIDS virus in our ideology. Consequently, the defenseless body became prey to neofascists, libertarians, and God knows what other scum. Sick ambitions ran riot. This is totally unrelated to society's needs. In Georgia, for example, there were 146 political parties contesting the latest elections. This is the motley crowd that the said people still have to feed. Instead of a single "enslaver"—146 "liberators."

Having captured all power in the mass media from the CPSU's position, he became a kind of "godfather" to an entire network of carefully brought up and deployed "family members." When the party came to its senses and heeded the voices of indignation, A.N. Yakovlev started reassuring the panic mongers, saying: "There is no point in having a go at the press. It only reflects reality the way it is. There is no need to chop off the messenger's head simply because he has brought bad news!" And he went on, along more or less the same lines, claiming: "The press is nothing more than a mirror!" Someone who considers himself an architect of state policy cannot sincerely utter these words. He must know that, in our times, the press and the mass media are a decisive lever for the targeted shaping of social awareness. He must remember the words by former U.S. President Nixon, who said that it is more advantageous to invest $1 in the press than $10 in arms: Arms are hardly likely to utter a

word, while the press is shooting its mouth off from morning till night. A.N. Yakovlev should have known that a newspaper, a journal, and so on is the sole commodity in the world which is sold below cost under all economic systems, because its main purpose is to mold people's minds. You can sense the direction of this molding from a newspaper's contents and, if you were to lift the screen and look at its sources of finance, you would realize who is calling the tune. Lightly scratch the surface of any news sheet that ostentatiously styles itself "Independent" and you will reveal the face of the puppet-master "sponsor" who pulls the strings. Could it be that A.N. Yakovlev did not know how simple it was for the U.S. mass media apparatus to persuade the fairly mature U.S. society to change its appraisal of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam; how the Chinese were transferred from the ranks of enemies to those of friends when this suited the U.S. government. If "our hero" were to stop being naive in his appraisals of the press, he would be forced to admit that he is doing exactly the same by deliberately molding the views of people who are confused and, furthermore, embittered by daily disorders.

A.N. Yakovlev makes no secret of the fact that he lost his communist beliefs a long time ago. Wide publicity was given to his answer to journalists about three vacant nails on his office walls, which used to hold portraits—including a portrait of Lenin. Back in 1990, he cynically said in one of his statements: "I have a 250-page volume analyzing my own vision of Marxism... I know that if these pages were to be published today, I would be hung from the nearest lamppost." And yet, for some reason, he is in no hurry to surrender his party membership card and is getting closer and closer to the general secretary of the CPSU, evidently assuming that it is still too early to leave the party, that the party is still powerful.

The following truth has been known for a long time: Those who have a clear-cut action program, proclaim it openly, and struggle for people's minds are political figures, while those who conceal their true objectives, who "show up darkly," who lean not toward political struggle but toward intrigue, who do not protect the president from criticism and yet hide behind him at the first sign of danger, have always been considered political hacks. Fate has presented us with exactly such a political hack in A.N. Yakovlev. His is a split personality: He may be a Communist but on the other hand he may not; he may be a most influential figure in the state but at the same time he does not carry responsibility for anything; he may be bold and resolute, but he has already managed to take cover beneath academic immunity; he seems to be calling for innovation, and yet devotes all his energy to the destruction of our home.

Whenever he traveled to the Baltics, Armenia, or Georgia to resolve interethnic contradictions, his visit was immediately followed by sinister mudflows of inveterate nationalism with added national-fascism. All the exhortations by People's Deputies Alksnis and Kogan, and all the demands by the party public that A.N. Yakovlev's speeches during these trips be published were to no effect. He constantly either lulled or deceived rank-and-file Communists. In December 1988, for example, speaking at the "Nauka" [Science] Publishing House, he declared: "I see nothing frightening in the people's fronts movements in the Baltics... there is a lot that is constructive there. There are people there saying that they must separate from the Soviet Union. But they are only a few. The majority realize that this is totally unrealistic."

That same year he visited Armenia but, in his speeches there, he deviated from support for the line elaborated by the country's leadership toward Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and hinted that he would be receptive toward the extremists' arguments. The ensuing whipping up of tension produced the start of bloody clashes, and the lives of young people who were senselessly sacrificed by political hacks lie also on his conscience.

But what are the origins of the inner inconsistency displayed by this man, who has already clearly realized that he has brought "the recipient of his advice" to an almost inevitable fiasco? Of course, Time will pass its verdict unaffected by current emotions and passions. It will remind us that practice alone is the criterion of truth, that end results alone determine the value of any advice that is given. But right now we can already clearly perceive the main deficiency in A.N. Yakovlev's constructions. He is totally ignorant of his own country and his own people. He is distinguished by an abstract vision of the society that had to be reformed and by voluntarism in his selection of means.

The former communist ideologist took it upon himself, whether of his own accord or at someone else's prompting, to reorganize a gigantic state overnight in the Western style, to immediately implant in it democracy, glasnost, economic prosperity, and cultural rebirth. The only point he overlooked was that the Western countries, from where he decided to copy a beautiful painting and transplant it in our own motherland, have arrived at their present stage after centuries of evolutionary development. Hence the embarrassing confusion experienced by the architect of perestroyka and his persecution by the threat of "new authoritarianism", without him even knowing where it might originate—among the neo-Stalinists or among "the democratic forces which proved unequal to their task, and succumbed to the temptation to make a name for themselves by means of cheap intrigues and confrontation with other forces..." "Generally," he laments, "once again intolerance is rearing its head, once again there is evidence of authoritarian and totalitarian behavior." A truly sad and depressing conclusion! A.N. Yakovlev himself admits that a law is powerful when it reflects and consolidates already established social relations, when it stems from life, and he himself hints that real life should be replaced by a creation of laws. No matter what lawmaking marathons our ardently enthusiastic parliamentarians might organize, the capital will still be flooded by a stream of letters

and telegrams claiming that the law is not being implemented, that it is ineffective, that it is being trampled.

In its history, Russia did experience a rushed adoption of Western civilization under Peter I, but Peter earned the title of Great because he did everything for the sake of the fatherland's glory, he replaced all demolished institutions straightaway by new and more effective ones, taking from the foreign countries everything good they had to offer without losing whatever was good in his own country. People traveled abroad to learn, not to trade their consciences. He himself was farsighted, his advisers were more liberal, but none of this went down well with the people.

As for the current "chamber orchestra of reformers" headed by Senior Adviser A.N. Yakovlev, it brings to mind the kid who kept telling himself "The table's legs are too high—I'll file them down a little" and filed his parents' table down to the ground.

Yavlinskiy News Conference on Economic Reform

PM2406160191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by Sergey Samokhvalov: "The Sooner, the Cheaper. Yavlinskiy on His Program"]

[Text] At a press conference yesterday Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Center for Economic and Political Research, summed up the results of his work on draft economic reforms with the participation of Western countries.

The program which was submitted to Gorbachev for examination last Monday is called "Window of Opportunity" and runs to 100 pages of typescript. Its main objectives are the same as those of the "500 Days" program. There is only one more section—"The interests of the West and the future of the USSR."

The Yavlinskiy-Primakov program differs from the Union program in that it is geared to the West and also in that it takes account of the potential of all the republics including those which do not intend to sign the Union Treaty.

The author is convinced that in any case we will need the assistance of the developed countries. I quote: "The credit which the Union government is receiving is being used inefficiently. The best thing would be to channel these funds into the implementation of this project." This is Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's view. "The integration of our economy in the economy of the West is not a foolish idea. The sooner this process begins, the smaller the expenditure necessary to overcome the crisis," the economist believes.

MVD, OMON Take Over Moscow Airport Security

PM2406111191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by V. Prokopenko and Al. Murtazayev: "'Landing' Strip— The USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Are Carrying Out a Joint Operation at the Capital's Sheremetyevo Airport"]

[Text] There are hundreds of vehicles in front of the entrance to the airport building. There are cab drivers and private motorists meeting, dropping off, and waiting for customers, and a red "Icarus" squeezes in between this assembly and draws up to the building. That is all. A traffic jam two or three hours long.

Who has not exchanged curses here with the weary State Automobile Inspectorate worker? Who has not registered his baggage, not knowing in what state he will get it back? How many people besiege airport employees everyday in the hope of at least some day finding a missing item? Whoever has been through this has probably thought: "The most incredible thing is that the airport still manages to function somehow or other."

From the parking bay of the big-browed Boeings and bulky Aeroflot planes to the storehouse is "the road of life." This is the cynical name given to this 1.5 km distance by the local crooks. The baggage car travels along at night, something falls off, you look, but by morning it has already been "cleared away." It was on this path that the two bags of hard currency that made such a big scandal lay scattered. These bags were evidently one of the reasons for the changes as Sheremetyevo.

The USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] recently made a major decision. Now units of the Internal Troops and OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] and representatives of other MVD services have been assigned on a long-term basis to the civil airport complex.

"They don't do a lot of talking," the officials complained to us. "The minute something happens, they reach for the big stick!" "The boys know their job," the leaders of the operation inform us, not without pride. "They have been through the airports in Transcaucasia, and there the situation is much more difficult."

The militia has to a considerable extent elbowed aside the paramilitary security forces and closed off all 16 checkpoints on the airport complex territory. And although, when our photographer appeared, the girls employed from outside the department rushed to leave their familiar posts and join the militia cordon, they say that the militia agents, observing their work the day before the operation, had not recorded a single inspection of a car leaving Sheremetyevo.

Now the drivers patiently wait their turn to be examined. Say what you like, assault rifles instill respect. But not

everyone, and not right away, began to "respect" OMON. From the very beginning of the operation more than 90 drivers were "logged" every day breaking the airport complex traffic regulations. Around 100 people paid a visit to the duty unit. A yellow van with a blue stripe now cruises up and down the "road of life" 24 hours a day. On 17 June criminal proceedings were instituted against an employee of a joint enterprise for the theft of a video camera.

But if people inside the airport complex are very quickly getting used to the special situation, chaos continues to reign near Sheremetyevo-2 airport train station. In general, long-term parking is forbidden—there is not enough room. At the same time the drivers have nowhere to go. Not one of them is willing to leave his car a few kilometers down the road. This is understandable—it will be driven away.

The long drawn-out battle between the Ministry of Civil Aviation and the Moscow City Soviet for land to use as a parking lot has produced no results.

"We are here for three months," Militia Major General V. Goncharov says. "After this operation a special militia subunit will be set up which will oversee order in the airport complex."

MVD Troops End Training Exercise in Siberia

LD2406222991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] An exercise of internal troops, the major one in recent years, has ended in the Siberian city of Omsk. Taking part were public security forces deployed in the Asian part of the Russian Federation. The internal troops practiced ways of guarding, escorting, and detaining especially dangerous criminals.

Papers Menaced by Rising Production Costs

PM2506083191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article under the rubric "The Press and the Market": "One More Blow to Glasnost?"]

[Text] It seems only recently that passions were raging over last year's subscription campaign because of the price hike imposed on newspapers and magazines at that time... You remember, of course—a great deal was written during those months to the effect that, owing to the ruthlessly intransigent position of communications and paper industry monopolists and the complete indifference of government bodies, the press was in essence driven into a corner and pushed to the brink of bankruptcy. Prices climbed and the print runs of even the most popular publications nosedived. Enormous harm was inflicted on glasnost.

Back in 1990 it seemed that the ordeal that had befallen the press was caused by temporary, transitional reasons. It seemed that the main thing was to endure the ordeal, and then normal and mutually acceptable, mutually advantageous relations would be formed between editorial staff, publishing houses, and their partners. Alas. A new subscription campaign has started to loom on the horizon, and once again terms are being dictated to the press. Even harsher and more ruinous terms... And once again we can do little more than sound the alarm. Which is precisely what many of our colleagues are doing. This is evident even from the headlines that have been appearing in the press: "Is Glasnost Getting Dearer Again?", "A Luxury, Not a Medium of Information," "One Newspaper for the Whole Country?"... "The Subscriber Must Be Protected"—this was the appeal addressed to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in the recent open letter from the editors of PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, and TRUD and the directors of the PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA publishing houses. Having outlined the disastrous state of the press, they came to a just conclusion: Glasnost, which has been called one of the principal achievements of perestroyka, is in danger.

We KRASNAYA ZVEZDA staffers feel solidarity with our colleagues. Because KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's position today is also truly dramatic. Judge for yourselves. One and a half years ago a tonne of paper cost us 220 rubles [R]. Last year it cost us between R800 and R880. Now other figures are already being mentioned—simply astronomical ones. Let us add to this that the Ministry of Communications intends to charge almost double for its services, and that transport and printing equipment are becoming more expensive.

It is only by making colossal efforts that we KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishing house staffers will manage to fulfill our commitments to our subscribers this year. However, we very much regret that, as far as next year is concerned, it is already clear now that we will be unable to maintain the preferential subscription price which we fixed at R13.80. But this is still not the biggest headache, so to speak. The prevailing situation is such that a new subscription price hike of between 150 and 200 percent is highly likely. And this is not just the position at KRASNAYA ZVEZDA—it is the same at many publications, such as PRAVDA, TRUD, IZVESTIYA, and others among the more widely read and mass-circulation newspapers and magazines which do not belong to the category of what is currently called the "commercial press."

It is a paradox that the publications that are suffering the most are those whose principal aim is not to make money but to serve the people by providing honest, responsible reporting. The gutter press, pornographic rags, and the homegrown yellow press are not having a hard time of it on the whole. They can hike prices, presenting temptation to paper makers and mail workers and filling up and flooding the kiosks of the Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter with filthy scum. And so practically the entire central press has now become unprofitable and is making a loss. Even though a few years ago these publications,

including KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, brought in a considerable income. Well, have the newspapers gotten worse or less interesting? Of course not, the main reason is the thoughtless pricing policy.

Unfortunately, people occasionally form the impression that all the press' woes and the arbitrary way it is treated are matters purely for journalists. As if there are not millions of readers behind them. But the country's leadership and the higher organs of power have been somehow reluctant and ineffectual in looking into this problem. Last year everything was allowed to drift. After numerous appeals by citizens and insistent demands by journalists, including those in the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, there were rather stormy debates in the union parliament. The result was an instruction to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to adopt urgent economic measures to guarantee stable working conditions for the periodical press.

The Cabinet of Ministers will respond, of course. But will the measures be adopted in time? After all, many things such as the question of setting next year's subscription prices should be decided by the publishing houses right now, literally today. Nor is it clear at the moment how cardinal the measures by the Cabinet of Ministers will be. The idea is to establish firm prices for paper and communications services, and transport tariffs relating to press distribution. Any increase in prices above the prescribed levels should be subsidized from the state budget, as is customary in all civilized countries. The establishment of a preferential system of taxation for the periodical press and publishing activity linked to its production could also play a major role. Other measures are also possible, but the big question is whether the Cabinet of Ministers is capable of taking them. Will the resources be found in the Treasury? Time is slipping by, but matters are still unclear...

In any case all of us, dear readers and friends of the newspaper, must also think about what we can achieve through our own efforts, about ways of alleviating the price burden. We must show initiative, entrepreneurship, and organizational acumen. Let's be frank: Today KRASNAYA ZVEZDA is looking especially to military-political organs, military commissariats, organizations of the Voluntary Society for Assisting the Army, Air Force, and Navy, and patriotic military clubs and associations for assistance in promoting and distributing the newspaper. We are appealing to everyone who cares about the future of the central military press to join in the search for new ways of organizing subscriptions to it and new ways of distributing it.

There are various possible options here. Communists from various military units, civilian enterprises, institutions, and organizations might consider it expedient to allot a portion of party funds to provide subscriptions to the periodical press for their members. We would be grateful if they would spare a thought for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA when they do this.

A proposal has also been put to veterans' councils. Many of those who took part in the war and who have read our newspaper for decades have been forced to part company with it owing to the price rise. But why not subscribe to the newspaper in groups of two, three, or four people? This is less costly. Of course, a certain degree of coordination and organization will be needed, which in our view could be done by the veterans' councils.

Last year the newspaper saw its first sponsors who provided funds on a charitable basis to be used for free subscriptions to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA for veterans, disabled Afghan veterans, and other categories of low-income citizens. We are pleased to state that examples of this kind are multiplying. Thus, a small Sverdlovsk enterprise run by reserve officer Ye. Votintsev paid for subscriptions to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA for 1,000 war veterans and former soldiers who fought in Afghanistan. The "SANTR" Scientific and Technical Society in Krasnoyarsk, which is run by V. Morozov, has paid for subscriptions to our newspaper for 700 veterans of the Great Patriotic War. We think this kind of action should be encouraged. Therefore KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's editorial board has made a decision: Those who come forward to sponsor subscriptions to our newspaper will be given the right to publish advertisements on highly preferential terms.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has plenty of friends. This is evidenced by the latest newpaper festival that has just been held in the M. Gorkiy Central Park of Culture and Recreation and by the editor's mailbag. Over recent months we have been receiving many readers' letters expressing support for the newspaper and confidence in it. "KRASNAYA ZVEZDA is my future and my life," combat veteran I. Stepanishchev writes from Sevastopol, for example. "I cannot imagine being parted from it. It is bad that the subscription cost is going up—my pension is not very large. But I personally shall subscribe to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA whatever the cost. The most important thing is to stick to your position and not to betray yourself." Captain Third Rank V. Pomozov puts the question in a somewhat different perspective: "KRASNAYA ZVEZDA is the voice of the Army and Navy community. The bigger its print run, the greater its influence and authority. I know that things are currently difficult for the newspaper, and I think that the duty of every serviceman, and not just of servicemen but of everyone who cares how weighty the voice of patriotic society sounds, is to support the newspaper. How? By subscribing to it above all!"

This comment may seem somewhat categorical to some. But it is basically correct—the newspaper does in fact need this kind of support. And we believe that the true friends of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA will stay with it whatever surprises the economic and political situation has in store for us. We believe this, and needless to say we shall do all we can both to make the contents of our newspaper more interesting, more attractive, and more effective, and also to ensure that in terms of cost it remains among the most accessible of the central newspapers.

Journalists Protest Mail Delivery Charge Increase

PM2406131591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "An SOS Signal Again!"]

[Text] Not so long ago PRAVDA described the troubles of the mailmen and with them sought ways of resolving their problems. And now prices for the delivery and distribution of the press have increased and the communications departments have a day off, yet the situation has become even worse.

In yesterday's issue of GUDOK the journalists' collective of that newspaper was obliged to address an open letter to USSR Communications Minister G. Kudryavtsev. It says frankly: The planned drastic increase of up to 52 percent in the cost of mail services for the delivery of newspapers and journals will obviously cause another reduction in the print runs of all publications. You form the impression that the mail department has one general line—the hiking of prices, which scarcely affects the material position of ordinary employees in the peripheral mail network.

How to explain the following fact: Newspapers, which continue to be published on schedule, are delivered with a delay of three to four days? Often several back issues of publications are delivered at the same time and these "wholesale" offerings are seen by readers as an insult.

In the market economy good money will only be paid for excellent work. So what is the trouble? After all so far we are paying the mail department very good money for appalling work. Will this continue for long?

PRAVDA journalists are also signing this appeal from their colleagues. On the eve of the latest subscription campaign displaying a lack of discipline and unreliability and twisting the arms of editorial offices and readers is a disgrace for a department whose work should be based on promptness and precision. Yet one cannot be endlessly patient...

Together with our colleagues from GUDOK and all other newspapers and journals, we expect an effective response and real measures from you, comrade minister!

TASS Reviews 25 Jun Soviet Central Press

LD2506064491 Moscow TASS in English 0529 GMT 25 Jun 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—President Mauno Koivisto of Finland arrived on an official visit in Moscow on Monday at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, today's newspapers report.

Koivisto had talks with Gorbachev. Later that same day Gorbachev and his wife Raisa hosted a dinner in the honour of the Finnish president and his wife.

PRAVDA publishes speeches Gorbachev and Koivisto exchanged at the dinner.

PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carry a TASS report that Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl had a brief exchange of views about the schedule for their joint work. They agreed to hold a one-on-one meeting near Kiev on July 5.

Gorbachev sent greetings to Socialist International President Willy Brandt on the occasion of the organisation's 40th anniversary. The message is published in PRAVDA.

The Soviet parliament on Monday discussed a bill destatisation and privatisation. "After a debate, the parliament decided to publish the bill and began discussing it article by article," PRAVDA writes.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes Gorbachev's decree "On the Endorsement of Regulations for Military Councils in the USSR Armed Forces, USSR State Security Committee Troops, Interior Ministry Troops and Railroad Troops" and the decree to award the title of Hero of Socialist Labour to developers of Soviet missiles (posthumously).

The newspaper publishes the text of Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov's speech at the June 22 meeting with World War Two veterans.

PRAVDA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, TRUD and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA report that the USSR State Bank will begin issuing new one-rouble bills from June 27.

The Soviet Parliament on June 11 passed bills changing taxes in the country. PRAVDA carries an interview with Finance Minister Vladimir Orlov on the issue.

The Russian parliament presidium met in Moscow on Monday under the chairmanship of Ruslan Khasbulatov, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports.

The newspaper carries an interview with Russian Communist Party Secretary Gennadiy Zyuganov, who comments about reforms in the party.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's answers to readers' questions.

The newspaper analyses workers' movement in the Urals.

TRUD interviews Russian Council of Oil and Gas Workers Trade Union Chairman Lev Mironov, who speaks about problems facing Russian oil workers.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN publishes a resolution by the founding congress of the USSR Peasants' Union "On Implementing Decisions of the Founding Congress" passed on June 18.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comments on the possibile free sale of weapons in the Soviet Union.

The newspaper interviews historian Grigoriy Kuzmin about the Korean War.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments on President Gorbachev's forthcoming meeting with leaders of the G-7 industrialised nations.

PRAVDA runs an interview with Greek Communist Party leader Alexandra Papariga.

Economic

Cabinet Approves Trade With Comecon, Others

OW2506033691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers signed a ruling on June 23 permitting barter operations with the former CMEA countries and some other states: Yugoslavia, China, North Korea, Laos, Cambodia, the eastern German lands, India, Syria, Egypt and Afghanistan.

Under the ruling barter deals are to be concluded for manufactured and engineering products, but not for primary commodities or agricultural produce.

Commenting on the ruling the head of the State Foreign Economic Commission Valentin Demchuk has described it as "vital but belated". Though that ruling protects the former economic links, it will be impossible in the remaining 6 months of the year to reach last year's turnover with the former members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The trade with them has disastrously shrunk since the beginning of this year", explained Demchuk. [quotation mark as received]

Leningrad Defense Conversion Conference Held

PM2506092991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by S. Brish: "Not Only Riveting Pans"]

[Text] Moscow—A recent scientific and practical conference on "prospects and problems of the work of instrument building enterprises under the conditions of conversion" held in Leningrad was devoted to the search for access to new paths of conversion. The organizers of the conference which, incidentally, attracted leaders of the defense production facilities of the country's largest scientific and industrial center, were the Leningrad optical instruments association and the international conversion foundation. There was talk about the loading of the released production capacities, including loading which would enable enterprises equipped with the latest word in technology to do more than rivet pans—enable them to avoid losing their high potential and engineering and scientific cadres.

And of course the conference talked seriously about the change in the specific "psychology" of the defense industry workers, when they are having to lose the habit of guaranteed orders, funds, and finance and learn to live under market conditions.

These problems were touched on most fully in the report delivered by Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor M. Ananyan, president of the international conversion foundation.

After the conference M. Ananyan gave details of his view of the problems of conversion.

"The main thing is to understand that conversion is not only the process of the demilitarization of the military sectors of the economy. Throughout the world conversion is a general human problem, it is connected with the alteration of age-old stereotypes of the economic activity of all states. We are against the idea of 'building conversion' in one individual country. We already have the concept of global conversion and the foundation is implementing this concept in practice."

Conference on Developing Enterprise To Be Held

OW2406112091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The first national conference on the ways to promote enterprise will be held in Moscow on June 25-26. It is sponsored by the Scientific and Industrial League which incorporates plants accounting for 65 percent of the country's industrial products.

The conference is to determine the policy of assisting in the best way possible those engaged in enterprise regardless of the forms of property and location, as well as assess the possible contribution of enterprise to the endeavors to overcome the crisis in the country by means of transition to free market.

The conference will take place at the conference hall of the building housing the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, 56 Novy Arbat, 1st Floor, Sector 1. Organizing committee telephones: 206-70-15; 206-14-91.

Plant's Furniture-Making Hits Supply Problem

PM2106101791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by A. Bardo, N. Osipov, identified by caption, from Chita]

[Excerpt] We have reported more than once about production collectives which are managing, despite extremely difficult conditions, to maintain a high production pace. Our correspondents in the Transbaykal region have sent in a reportage about one such enterprise—the Chita engine repair plant.

[Bardo] The former KamAZ Association, which is now a joint-stock company, is housing its enterprise in the premises of the former Avtozapchast [spare parts] plant

which used to belong to the ZIL [Moscow Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant].

At the time, that is just over 3 years ago, the engine repair workers were promised big subsidies and all-around assistance in the reconstruction, retooling, and production buildup. As usually happens, because of various circumstances, the promises were not kept and the plant was left to cope with its problems essentially on its own. Nonetheless, it managed not only to survive, but also to find its feet, as they say, and even to find considerable sums of money to spend on its social program.

No, there was no miracle. This furniture is made from polyurethane foam. Its production at the enterprise is considered just as important as the engine repairs. The demand for this output—it is greatly superior to the normally used "Paralon"—exceeded all expectations. However, the joy was shortlived. The Dzerzhinsk "Korund" production association in Nizhniy Novgorod Oblast has stopped supplying the necessary chemicals. But it seems that the day we shot this reportage was the last day without work. A solid supply of raw materials sufficient for 6 weeks had arrived from Dzerzhinsk.

[Passage omitted]

Refrigerator Plant Inaugurated in Mari ASSR

PM2006085791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" newscast: Report by V. Razinkin, identified by caption, from Volzhsk]

[Text] [Announcer] The inauguration of the "Sovitalprodmash" Soviet-Italian joint venture has taken place in Volzhsk, Mari ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

[Razinkin] Giant plants are not in fashion, as it were, today. But the "Sovitalprodmash" is precisely such a plant. It covers an area of some 120,000 square meters. This is the country's first, and the world's biggest industrial center for the production of commercial refrigeration equipment. The plant was built in record time—two and a half years. All the equipment has been supplied and installed by the Italian Fata company. The premises and other structures were built by Mari construction workers. Electrical accessories and automation equipment has been supplied by the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry.

The plant's output comprises refrigeration chests and chambers for the storage and preservation of fresh produce and also refrigerated store shelves. Output volume is to reach 200 million rubles [R] in the current year. And by 1993 it is to quintuple, reaching rated capacity.

Longer-term plans comprise the production of fast freezers and refrigerated vehicles for the transportation of dairy, meat, and vegetable produce over long distances. This is a realistic opportunity to rid ourselves of the colossal losses which we are sustaining at present during the transportation, processing, and storage of produce.

Poll Shows Business Tempered by Uncertainties

PM2006114991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Hopes and Possibilities"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Statistics conducted a survey involving 6,000 republic inhabitants, the results of which reflect the population's attitude toward the development of new forms of economic management in the republic economy (see table).

One in five people would like to become the owner or joint owner of an enterprise. Of those, 20 percent expressed a desire to open their own business in the sphere of goods production, 16 percent in agriculture, 14 percent in trade, and 13 percent in consumer services.

Above all there is a lack of the necessary resources for organizing one's own business (30 percent of respondents), followed by too few legal guarantees (23 percent), and a lack of confidence in the long-term prospects for the new processes (20 percent). Only 2 percent of the respondents believed they had everything necessary for such activity.

By the start of April 1991, 11,500 retail trade enterprises and 16,700 public catering enterprises had been sold (transferred) to collective ownership (including leasehold). Thirty-one retail trade enterprises were transferred to individual private ownership, of which 20 were food stores.

Fourteen enterprises from the public catering network were sold to individual private owners.

Following the adoption of the RSFSR Laws "On Land Reform" and "On Peasant (Farm) Holdings," the procedure for forming peasant holdings was activated. As of 1 May 1991, 20,200 peasant (farm) holdings were registered in the RSFSR (compared with 13,600 on 1 April this year).

Percentage Considering New Forms of Economic Management To Be...

	Good	Bad	Hard to Say
Farm Holdings	65.4	10.6	24.0
Individual Labor Activity	65.0	14.5	20.5
Cooperative Enterprises	32.6	42.1	25.3
Privately Owned Enterprises	26.7	37.5	35.8
Wholly Foreign Owned Enterprises	12.2	52.3	35.3

Workers' Efficiency Earns High Living Standards

PM2406151591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by A. Shvetsov and V. Lunev, speakers identified by captions]

[Text] [Announcer] Labor collectives are finding different ways out of the crisis. The gas production workers at Nadym think that the most important way is through efficient labor.

[A. Shvetsov] The people living in the village of Pangody [as heard] are those who work at one of the largest gas deposits in the extreme north of Tyumen—the Medvezhye. I have visited this village in different years and, believe me, I have had less than wonderful experiences there. Everything was provisional there, including the modest temporary dwellings of the earliest explorers of this land, and the almost complete lack of any social and cultural facilities. Today in Pangody there are modern schools, a cultural center, a sports complex, a medical institution, and nursery schools which are so well-equipped as to make people in the rest of the country jealous. Last year alone a total of 5,000 square meters of accommodation was put up here. A whole street of comfortable cottages like these [video shows houses] has been built. An extensive program of social protection for every worker is also operating successfully. It is reflected in the labor collective's code and provides substantial financial compensation for young workers and pensioners alike. Just a small example: Food is free for everyone working in the Nadymgazprom enterprises. So why do the Nadym gas workers have a much higher living standard than many other people in the north?

[V.V. Remizov, general director of Nadymgazprom production association] Because they work. They work and they count how much to spend on the collective and the needs of the collective. This approach has made it possible for us to fully implement the program of demolishing temporary and dilapidated accommodation in the space of five years. So in five years we took down 1,120 temporary dwellings and resettled people in proper housing.

Agricultural

Orel Declares Harvest-Related State of Emergency

LD2406195791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] The mass media carried an alarming piece of news today. A state of emergency has been declared on the territory of the Orel Oblast. The presidium of the oblast soviet of people's deputies resorted to this extreme measure because procurement of hay is taking place at an intolerably slow rate. Old inhabitants cannot remember the kind of grass harvest that has been received this year. Many plots are providing yields of between five and seven tonnes of dry hay per hectare. However, the rates of fodder procurement are far from expected and are not in keeping with the possibilities of the agro-industrial complex. There are also objective reasons. There are few people in the countryside. The weather is hot and dry. Under these conditions delays with hay procurement lead to harvest losses.

RSFSR Land Reform Newspaper Appears

914B0181D Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Jun 91 p 6

[Article by N. Skorolupov: "Welcome, KRESTYANSKAYA ROSSIYA!"]

[Text] The first issue of KRESTYANSKAYA ROSSIYA has come out. Its founders are the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Media, the RSFSR State Committee for Land Reform, and the collective of the editorial board.

Numerous articles of the first issue contain appeals to the readers by Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers. In particular, in an interview with KRESTYANSKAYA ROSSIYA, Boris Yeltsin expresses confidence that the "Russian newspaper for the peasant will actively help in the implementation of agrarian reform and the restoration of the old fame of the Russian farmer."

Central Chernozem Regional Association Founded

914B0181C Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Jun 91 p 5

[Article by unidentified SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent: "An Association of Oblasts Has Been Created"]

[Text] Voronezh, 4 June—Last week representatives of several oblasts of the Central Chernozem region united in an economic association.

V.K. Kalashnikov, chairman of the Voronezh Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, told me that its goal is to strengthen horizontal economic ties in the region to resolve production and—most importantly—social problems.

Some of the people I talked to in various oblasts express doubts about the advisability of the new experiment: They ask whether it is worth creating these strengthened "councils of the national economy." What will the organization give them?

"Economic and financial independence," answered B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, speaking at an assembly of the soviet and farm aktiv of Voronezh Oblast.

The documents for the creation of the association stipulate a significant delegation of rights to the local level. No less than 60 percent of the hard currency receipts will remain in oblasts belonging to the association instead of the 15-20 percent that is presently received. Additional hard currency income will go to stabilize the economy and will be used for social protections for scientific, technical, and intellectual potential and development of the agro-industrial complex. For the first time the conclusion of barter transactions and the licensing of exports will be transferred to the local level; until now, this has been the prerogative of the Union Government.

Scientific

Space Walk To Replace Damaged Antenna Planned

LD2406185691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Tonight cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev, working in the Mir orbital complex, are to go out into open space for a complicated assembly operation. The cosmonauts have to replace the antenna that facilitates approach and docking with the orbital complex for manned and cargo craft. This antenna is currently damaged, creating considerable difficulties for the crews.

Mayak will keep you constantly informed about the development of events in space. The first live report from Flight Control Center will go out in our 2330 bulletin.

Cosmonauts Begin Work

LD2406214791 Moscow TASS in English 2122 GMT 24 Jun 91

[by TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Mosvow June 25 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev have just begun extravehicular activities.

Artsebarskiy and Krikalev—the crew of the ninth main expedition—have been working on board the orbital complex Mir for the second month.

The principal aim during their first spacewalk is to replace the antenna which ensures the guidance and docking of a spaceship with the orbital complex and which is installed on the astrophysical module Kvant.

Artsebarskiy and Krikalev are expected to stay outside the orbital station for more than five hours.

Experimental Girder Installed

LD2506082891 Moscow TASS in English 0702 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—Cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev spent five hours in space Monday night, replacing an antennae on the Kvant module docked with the Mir space station.

The cosmonauts opened the hatch of the Mir station at [figures indistinct] Moscow time and replaced the antenna system with a new one delivered by the progress M-8 cargo space ship.

They also installed an experimental girder designed to evaluate the efficiency of thermomechanical compositions during the erection of large structures in open space on the Kvant-2 module.

The crew spent a total of four hours 58 minutes in open space. Both Artsebarskiy and Krikalev are feeling well after the spacewalk, doctors said.

Antenna Replacement Complete

LD2506053491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0430 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] Today our cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev have been working in open space all night. They spent five hours outside the station, and replaced the antenna which ensures the approach and docking of the cargo craft with the orbital complex. The cosmonauts have already taken their suits off, and are currently working inside the station.

Philosophical, Economic Science Forum Held

PM2406140391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Academicians, Take an Order"]

[Text] On 19 June this year the USSR Academy of Sciences held a "roundtable" devoted to questions of the development of philosophical and economic sciences in the country. Leading scientists took part in the debate—members of the USSR Academy of Sciences and representatives of the academies of sciences of the union republics and higher educational establishments. Reports were delivered by Academicians I.T. Frolov, S.S. Shatalin, V.V. Zhurkin, V.N. Kudryavtsev, T.I. Oyzerman, N.I. Iskanderov, and others. There was a discussion of fundamental problems facing Soviet social sciences and of the provision of cadres. Note was taken of the crisis situation of many sectors of social science in which ideology used to dominate and entirely suppress their scientific content. At the same time it was noted that many ideas which are being widely implemented in the course of perestroyka have long been maturing in the minds of scientists—they include priority for general human values, the vital importance of resolving global problems, and the orientation of science and social and technical progress toward man.

The participants in the "roundtable" stressed that the social order addressed to social science often remains unheeded yet the future of our country largely depends on the results of the work of scientists and their professional standard, competence, and civic stance. That can be applied primarily to economists, who are faced with the task of considering ways of transferring to a market economy and entering the world economy.

The "roundtable" revealed the specific problems and tasks of the philosophical and economic sciences which will be the subject of discussion of the fall session of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Military

Fighter Sales to Israel Not Soviet Policy

LD2406155491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1402 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 24 June. (TASS)—A USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs representative described at a briefing today reports of the willingness of Soviet manufacturers to sell modern fighter interceptors to Israel as not reflecting Soviet policy.

"According to reports which have come in, at the airshow in Le Bourget the USSR minister for the aviation industry declared the readiness of Soviet manufacturers to sell a defense variant of the Mig-31 fighter interceptor to Israel, said Vitaliy Churkin, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Adminstration. "In this connection I want to emphaize that the sale of arms to foreign countries, including, of course, Israel, is a prerogative of the government. The statement at the Le Bourget airshow which has been mentioned does not reflect the policy of the Soviet Government."

YAK-141 Discussed; Designer Interviewed

LD2306215891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent L. Elin] One of the sensations of the Paris Air Show that just ended was the new military plane created by the Yakovlev Design Bureau. Not long before this, at the beginning of June, the world records for speed, climbing speed, and so on, in vertical takeoff planes were set in precisely this plane, on test flights. Today, you have a very rare opportunity to see this plane for the first time on your screens. The film was shot by a cameramen of the Yakovlev Design Bureau from the ground and from a plane flying alongside.

Here it is, the YAK-141, an interceptor fighter which starts equally successfully from a runway after a short take off or ascending vertically from a small pad on a ship's deck. He continues on a new qualitative level the tradition of Aleksandr Yakovlev's Design Bureau established back in the sixties and seventies. Remember the words: Beautiful machines always fly well? No, our science has not grown short of talent. The YAK-141 is not just beautiful but also excellently armed. And the perfected piloting and navigational equipment make it possible for it to be used in the most difficullt meteorological conditions at any time of day or night. Its range of flight is 2,000 km.

As you watch the unique pictures taken during the record breaking flight by first class test pilot (Andrey Sinitsyn) let me remind you that in the aviation world there is, always has been, and always will be keen rivalry between the leading firms. Well, the YAK-141, at the present stage, has significantly outranked the achievements of planes of this type—the British Harrier and the U.S. AV-8. Compare them anyhow: The YAK's maximum speed is 1,800 km/h while its foreign equivalents reach slightly over 1,000 km/h.; its ceiling is 15km, while the Harrier's and AV-8's is only 11km; and most importantly for a multi-purpose military plane, its weapons payload is two and a half tonnes, far more than the British and U.S. vertical take off and landing planes. Hence the great interest with which news of this plane's flights was met at Le Bourget. [Video shows shots of YAK-141 performing horizontal and vertical take offs, and in flight, pilot in cockpit, horizontal landing.]

[Elin, speaking to (A.N. Dondukov) in studio] Well, literally an hour ago, the plane carrying (Aleksandr Nikolayevich Dondukov) general designer of the Yakovlev Design Bureau, landed at Sheremetyevo and he is here in the studio with us now. Tell us, what was the main thing at the show in Le Bourget.

[Dondukov] The main thing to note is this: The exhibition was devoted to the victorious international forces in the Gulf and the main thing to note is the unusual, intensive rise in the development of military equipment. That was the main area and civil equipment was somewhat sidelined.

[Elin] You mean planes that have already been shown?

[Dondukov] Yes.

[Elin] Well, I think that this was, nonetheless, the first time that YAK has been represented by a military plane?

[Dondukov] Yes, for the first time, and I would even be hard pressed to say over what period of time.

[Elin] (Aleksandr Nikolayevich), tell me please, we have shown this marvellous new machine. Are there plans for it to be sold?

[Dondukov] You know, we are proposing a different path of cooperation, namely the joint development of vertival takeoff equipment.

[Elin] With whom?

[Dondukov] I believe that the first partner may be India, but we have already held talks with both Italy and Britain.

[Elin] And another question which I believe will interest many viewers: Can the ideas put into designing this plane be used when making civilian planes?

[Dondukov] I believe that this vertical takeoff and landing equipment using small pads will be for civilian planes in the future.

[Elin] Can it be said that you are already beginning work on such planes?

[Dondukov] Well, if we are talking about the next generation of our successors, then probably yes.

[Elin] Well thank you for the interview and we wish you success.

[Dondukov] Thank you very much.

Committee Chief Sharin on Military Reform Laws

OW2206040491 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 2230 GMT 8 Jun 91

[Interview with Leonid Vasilyevich Sharin, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee, by journalist S. Guryanov; from the "Radar-TV" program; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Guryanov] Leonid Vasilyevich, this is not the first year that our Armed Forces—and not only our Armed Forces, but the entire country—have been waiting for a package of legislation which will regulate defense construction in our country, service conditions, and so on. Tell us please, what stage has the work on this law reached.

[Sharin] Yes indeed, in sorting through our committee's mail—we receive a large number of letters—in which interested people, servicemen—but not only servicemen—say that laws which would regulate the activities of servicemen, their social provisions and security, and generally all the reforms in the armed services are being delayed. I must say that this is a very complicated and difficult process. It has been going on now for nearly two or maybe more years. Nonetheless, today, I can say that we are close to our aim.

First and foremost, the most fundamental of these documents is the law on defense. The draft of this law has already been reworked several times, taking into account all the numerous comments which have been made, and is now ready. Frankly, it has not been officially submitted to the Supreme Soviet yet, and there is a very good reason for this. The thing is, that this law requires, generally, that we first define what kind of state we will be, what we will look like. And, therefore, apparently, it will be difficult to adopt the Law on Defense and in practice, it can not be adopted before the Union Treaty is signed.

The next stage is the military reform, or the concept of the military reform, as it is more often called. This is also a document which has been repeatedly examined by our committee. And I must say that the past committee [meeting] was also devoted to the examination of this issue. [Video cuts to briefly show a document titled "Draft Law of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Universal Conscription and Military Service"]

Primarily, these are laws such as the Law Dealing With the Status of Servicemen in the USSR, and the Law on Universal Conscription and Military Service. These are two very important laws, and today perhaps they demand immediate adoption. They too have been reworked many times in the committee and by the government, and I must say that they are the ones that are the most complete today. [Video briefly shows document No.174717, addressed to A.I. Lukyanov and V.S. Pavlov, requesting the preparation of the enclosed draft legislation for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet, signed by M. Gorbachev on 17 May 1991.]

The president of the country has approached the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the Prime Minister of the USSR with the draft of these laws, so that they could make more precise definitions. Nevertheless, the procedure requires that the president himself appear before the Supreme Soviet so that it can begin to examine the laws. As you know, these laws are on the Supreme Soviet's agenda, and we hope that we can examine them, at least in the first reading by the latter part of June, that is, of course, if the president officially tables them in the Supreme Soviet.

So then, we are reviewing these laws and are not wasting time. We have a large correspondence on these issues and are discussing them in open and closed committee meetings. They have given us extensive grounds for reflection. And what we are doing now is trying to implement, or take another look at, those numerous comments which have been put forward by Deputies and citizens in general.

[Guryanov] Leonid Vasilyevich, a few words on the concept of military reforms, if we may. The thing is, as you recall, there have been very many publications and various rumors on the Lopatin version, the Ministry of Defense version, and so on. What has been adopted as a basis, finally?

[Sharin] Right! Well, I must say that, of course the concept of military reform is one of the fundamental acts in the package of all these laws. So, in fact, it attracted the interest of many. Some considered we did not only have the alternative concepts put forward by the group of deputies with which Deputy Lopatin worked with in mind, but others as well. That is why the official version, which came from the Cabinet of Ministers, and the version which came from the deputies was discussed

equally at the expanded meeting of the committee. We considered it necessary to adopt the Cabinet of Ministers' version as the basis, which was developed, naturally, with the active participation of the Ministry of Defense—under its guidance you could say. Nonetheless, we were very interested in viewpoints taken by other drafts, and that is why, in adopting the official military reform concept as a basis, we supplemented various sections with substantial parts from these other concepts. That is why the present document, that we have and which has been released, is not only the product of the government or the Ministry of Defense, but also includes the contributions of other groups of interested people who have put forward constructive proposals for its basis. Nonetheless, you know that several fundamental issues have been inserted into these concepts, which is why we have specifically adopted the official version.

The first issue is the structure of the Armed Forces themselves. There were after all, proposals that the Army be divided by national or regional characteristics, if not the whole Army, then at least part of it. Such a concept was put forward by the group of deputies headed by Lopatin. Well, we discussed it in depth, together with the participation of prominent specialists, and still came to the opinion that we must preserve the Army as a whole.

Further, we had a serious argument on what type of Army should we have, a professional or nonprofessional one, or one along the present lines of conscription. Really, there is a little cunning in this. When they speak of a professional army, they are implying a mercenary army, that is, a volunteer army. We did not immediately reject this thesis, this submission, and discussed it very seriously and comprehensively. Naturally, an army must be professional, because weapons are so complicated today that it is clear that it would be difficult to master this profession during a mere two years. Presently, everyone will serve two years, as you know, in the Navy included. However, in point of fact, today we are close to this status, because all the officers are highly professional people, warrant officers, sergeant majors, reenlistees, these too are professionals in essence, and only the rank and file are nonprofessional. That is why, having studied not only our own, but also international experiences, we came to the conclusion that the Army should not be a mercenary one but a universally conscripted one.

[Guryanov] To what extent were the opinions of the Republics considered in your deliberations on these laws?

[Sharin] You have asked a very important question. And of course, although we speak of building our Armed Forces today, this is the job of the center, as the agreement envisages. Nonetheless, of course, we know that the potentialities of the Army depend a lot on their mutual relations with the Republics and local authorities. The Army can not be isolated from the local authorities, and of course, relations with the republics on these matters are very important and interest us very much. That is why we sent the whole project package to all the republics, and have received a response from many of them. Incidentally, practically all the republics attended the committee discussions on the concepts of military reform, at least 9 or 10 of the republics attended and actively contributed their proposals, which were taken into account.

I am very grateful, and would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who responded on these laws, those who sent us letters with criticisms, good wishes, and constructive proposals. We are very thankful, and on behalf of the our committee I would like to express my deepest gratitude to them. The law will be examined in the first and second readings, so there is still a real opportunity to contribute proposals and I would like to urge everyone to take an active part, for which we would also be very thankful. [end recording]

Baltic Commander on Security Lapse at Arms Dump

PM2506093191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric: "Following KRASNAYA ZVEZDA article": "On a Powder Keg"]

[Text] That was the headline under which KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published 17 May this year an article by Senior Lieutenant I. Rudnikov concerning shortcomings in the organization of security at a fleet arsenal which led to an emergency—the theft of weapons and ammunition by Seaman K. Gelyastanov. Even after the event, the author of the article wrote, nothing has changed at the arsenal.

As Admiral V. Ivanov, commander of the Baltic Fleet, reported to the editorial office, the facts set out in the article did indeed take place and criminal proceedings were instituted. With the aim of eliminating shortcomings in security at the fleet arsenal, a plan of organizational and technical measures was elaborated, and technical security and alarm systems allocated to the fleet are being sent primarily to ammunition dumps and arsenals. Several additional nonstaff subunits have been formed from ships' crews and marine subunits to strengthen security at military installations.

However, as the commander of the fleet pointed out, it is not possible to resolve all these problems at fleet level. It is only at the level of the Ministry of Defense that you can resolve the question of increasing the pay of paramilitary security force riflemen. Only old-age pensioners will agree to perform security service for 110-130 rubles [R] and there are not even enough of them. Financial resources and construction materials for the renovation of the guarded perimeter fences are lacking too. The money needed to install security alarms even has to be taken out of sums allocated for... the construction of housing for servicemen.

Personnel from the fleet's subunits and ships had to be recruited for the work because of the lack of permanent

engineering and economic subunits at the dumps and arsenals, which does not help improve the security system either.

The fleet's applications for barbed wire and certain other kinds of equipment without which it is hard to establish reliable security at the installations are systematically not being met.

Yazov Revisits Army Command School, Recalls War

PM2406122791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at Alma Mater"]

[Text] On 20 June USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov met with the personnel of the Moscow Higher Combined-Arms Command School named for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

There was a lively, detailed discussion of a tragic date in our country's history—22 June 1941—and of the heroism of the Soviet people and their valiant Armed Forces.

The defense minister presented the students of the school he himself graduated from in 1942 with a set of radio equipment.

Military Official Stresses WWII Lessons

LD2106185691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 20 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people is an event of world history, the importance of which is difficult to overestimate. This war gave the world examples of genuine mass heroism, true patriotism, and selflessness. With these words, Aleksandr Ovchinnikov, first deputy chief of the main military political directorate of the USSR Armed Forces, opened a news conference in Moscow today devoted to the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the Great Patriotic War.

Speaking about the main lessons of this tragic period in the life of the country, General Ovchinnikov stressed that their topicality does not fade with time. The hard experience of the Great Patriotic War, in his words, convinces us that it is necessary to fight the military threat with all available political and economic methods long before the beginning of combat actions. If the opposite is the case, the general considers that one is forced to pay too high a price.

Major General Anatoliy Khorkov, acting head of the USSR institute of military history of the Ministry of Defense, has called attempts that have appeared recently in various media to distribute responsibility for the beginning of the Great Patriotic War between the leadership of the USSR and fascist Germany without proof and not standing up to any criticism. One cannot talk about the equal responsibility of an aggressor and a victim, he emphasized. Such an approach has nothing in common with historic truth.

Volkogonov Criticizes Soviet History of WWII

OW2406120991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] General Dimitriy Volkogonov declared that its impossible to write a truthful history of the 2nd World War in the Soviet Union "as long as scholarly works are handed over to the Marshals for approval instead of other scholars". Removed from the post of head of the editorial board preparing a 10-volume history of the war, Volkogonov gave a press conference at the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet on Friday, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union.

The prominent military historian General Volkogonov has accused of "a complete methodological ignorance" those experts who have barred the 1st volume from publication. He reminded that 5 years back he had named the figure of the war's victims in the Soviet Union—27 million people, 17 million civilians among them—which is now being quoted by the Defence Ministry "as some sort of revelation". According to Volkogonov, the number of Soviet prisoners of war was 4 million, 3,100,000 of them captured in the first year of the war.

Volkogonov explained he can't issue the 1st volume of the history with an independent publisher since this is not his personal, but a collective work. In his estimate a truly objective history of the war can't appear in the USSR before 20 or 30 years, when no more veterans are left surviving.

He added that his attempt to speak at the 28th Congress of the Communist Party exposing "the Communist utopia and criticizing the Party's programme" was cut short by the audience stamping feet. Whatever he did say was later struck off the Congress' record.

Volkogonov has informed the press-conference that he has published "The Barbarossa Plan" prepared jointly with German historians, and that he is now working on a book about Lenin the last of this planned triptych on the leaders of the revolution: Trotsky, Stalin and Lenin.

Volkogonov's Dismissal Viewed

OW2106051691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 20 Jun 91

["What Underlies the Dismissal of General Volkogonov?"—INTERFAX headline—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The dismissal of General Dmitriy Volkogonov who served as the head of the Military History Institute under the Soviet Defence Ministry is not a result of criticism showered by the highest military officials on the 1st volume of the History of the Great Patriotic War written under Volkogonov's leadership. The reason for dismissing the general is his old age, major-General Anatoly Khorkov, acting chief of the Military History Institute, told reporters in Moscow on Thursday. A new chief for the institute has not been appointed yet, he said.

The press conference was attended by Colonel-General Aleksandr Ovchinnikov, first deputy chief of the ministry's political department. The 1st volume of the History of the Great Patriotic War written under Volkogonov's leadership, he said, was rejected by the main editorial commission chaired by Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov because it understimated heroism displayed by the Soviet people at the initial phase of the war and presented the country's pre-war period, the 1930's in one-sided and negative light.

Participants in the press conference neither confirmed nor refuted the credibility of the record of the main editorial commission's session held to discuss the stand taken by Dmitriy Volkogonov. The record was published on June 18 by the NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (Independent Newspaper). The record contains strong criticism against Volkogonov and calls for closing the defence Ministry's archives to historians adhering to anti-Communist positions.

Veterans Issue Urge Support for Government

PM2106131991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jun 91 First Edition p 4

["Veterans' Appeal"]

[Text] The all-Union Council of War, Labor, and USSR Armed Forces Veterans and the Soviet War Veterans Committee have adopted an appeal to the Soviet people in connection with the 50th anniversary of hitlerite Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War. It says in part:

German fascism unleashed a war to destroy the socialist system and the Soviet state, and to enslave the peoples of the Soviet Union. It was the most terrible and bloody war in the world's history.

We paid a high price for the victory we won. The war claimed the lives of millions of Soviet people. Tremendous material destruction was wrought. Hundreds of cities and thousands of villages and hamlets lay in ruins.

We resolutely rebut the attempts of certain political forces and the actions of various types of turncoats denying or distorting all that is heroic in our history, and presenting our beloved motherland to the present generation only in black colors as some kind of empire of evil and violence. This is a malicious lie.

War, labor, and Armed Forces veterans, just like the entire Soviet people, favor the revolutionary renewal of society. But, unfortunately, we have to admit that the great hopes pinned on perestroyka have so far not been vindicated. Society is going through a very bad crisis, there is a sharp deterioration in people's living standards, morality and culture are declining, and in many parts of the country interethnic conflicts are raging.

It is painful and offensive for us to watch how the children and grandchildren of those who fought shoulder to shoulder in the trenches at Brest and Stalingrad, on the approaches to Moscow and Leningrad, who liberated the peoples of Europe from the brown fascist plague and stormed Berlin during the grim years of the war, are now beginning to shoot at each other. Our sacred land drenched with the sweat and blood of the older generations is becoming the subject of a forcible re-division. A great danger is threatening the Soviet socialist state.

On the eve of the 50th anniversary of the outbreak of the Great Patriotic war we call on you, dear compatriots, on behalf of the veterans who have passed through the grim school of life and have looked death in the face more than once, to pool the efforts of all the healthy forces in society, of all who hold the fate of our Fatherland dear, so that the political and economic crisis can be overcome as quickly as possible, and our country pulled out of the impasse.

[Signed] All-Union Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans.

Soviet War Veterans Committee.

Shlyaga Addresses Eastern MD Political Chiefs

PM2006152991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

["Our correspondent" report: "Assembly of Military Political Workers"]

[Text] An assembly of chiefs of military political organs of the Far Eastern, Transbaykal, and Siberian Military Districts has been held. Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, delivered the report "Urgent Problems of Military Political Work at the Contemporary Stage of Building and Developing the Armed Forces." The report made a comprehensive analysis of the state of military political work in units and combined units and of the operating style of renewed military political organs at the present stage of the military reform and defined specific ways for political organs to fulfill their new tasks and functions most efficiently. Great attention was devoted to questions of enhancing the prestige of military political organs and their implementation of the state's policy in the sphere of defense organizational development jointly with other organs of military management.

The participants in the assembly exchanged opinions on a wide range of questions connected with the practical activity of military political organs.

On the eve of the assembly Col. Gen. N.I. Shlyaga met with generals and officers and the personnel of a number of units. He spoke in detail about the sociopolitical situation in the country and the progress in reforming the Armed Forces and the military political and party structures of the Army and Navy and answered numerous questions from the participants in the meeting.

Surkov Visits Far Eastern Military Units

PM2106151991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Zaytsev report: "Frank Discussion"]

[Text] The purpose of party work in units and on ships today is to ensure by political means troop collectives' good-quality fulfillment of their set tasks. This, along with the need for ideological and organizational unity within party ranks and the need to enhance the role of primary party organizations, was mentioned in the course of conversations that M. Surkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the All-Army Party Committee, had with leaders and the party aktiv during his stay in the Far Eastern Military District and the Pacific Fleet.

M. Surkov visited army and navy collectives in Khabarovsk, Kamchatka, Sakhalin, and Vladivostok, met the crew of the Khabarovsk large ASW ship, and held receptions in garrisons to deal with personal questions. There was a frank discussion regarding the state of affairs in the country, the party, and the Army and the means of escaping from the state of crisis.

Whatever remedies are proposed here, the immediate task should be to resolutely boost Communists' political activeness, the secretary of the All-Army Party Committee stressed.

Moiseyev Welcomes McDonalds to Garrisons

LD2506083591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1526 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 24 June—The "McDonalds" sign which has become a symbol in the Soviet capital of "Obshchepit" [Soviet public catering organization], the Soviet version of Western food service, promises to appear also at a number of major garrisons of the USSR Armed Forces.

This prospect was discussed today at the USSR Defense Ministry by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and George A. Cohon, executive director of the "McDonalds" firm in Canada.

"This was an exceptionally useful meeting", Cohon declared at the end of the conversation. Commenting on the prospect for building McDonalds enterprises for Soviet servicemen, he stressed: "We have reached the conviction that such an opportunity exists".

"Our cooperation with "McDonalds" can yield good results", said General Moiseyev. He added that the matter is now up to the specialists. "We are ready for the broadest cooperation", noted the chief of the General Staff.

Baltic Republics

Estonia's Interior Minister Discusses OMON

OW2406074891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a briefing in Tallinn on June 21, Estonia's Interior Minister Olav Laanjarv claimed that "no one in Moscow wants to shoulder responsibility for the actions of the special purpose police (OMON) units".

Earlier this week, Estonia's and Latvia's interior ministers had attended an expanded meeting of the collegium of the Interior Ministry of the USSR. Mr Laanjarv said they had failed to obtain an unequivocal answer on who, after all, is in charge of the special police.

The Estonian minister said that he had handed over to the Soviet Union's Interior Minister Boris Pugo photographs relating to the latest assault on Estonia's border post at Ikla on its border with Latvia. Mr Pugo replied, however, that "according to information he had, no special purpose police units had ever operated in Estonia", Mr Laanjarv said.

Mr Laanjarv confirmed that Mr Pugo had recognized the independence of Estonia's Interior Ministry and Estonian police from the centre, which had been provided for by an agreement signed under the previous Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin.

Estonian Ministers View OMON, Wage Issues

LD2406223991 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Excerpts] Ain Saarna went along to the news conference after today's government session.

[Begin recording] [Saarna] [passage omitted] Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar—as is known—met Valentin Pavlov, USSR Government leader, last night in Moscow. [passage omitted] The most complex problem turned out to be that of sugar. That means that things are like this: The USSR no longer has—at the level of the USSR Central Government—any domestic reserves, and there is no sugar coming from Cuba. What are we doing about this ourselves? I can tell you that we are about to reach agreement with certain Swedish firms in order to buy in sugar for Estonia with hard currency. Then, of course, it will be sold at a commercial rate; and starting from September, we will be getting imported sugar from the Ukraine, according to the Estonian-Ukrainian treaty. The question is how to survive the interim period.

Olav Laanjarv, minister of internal affairs, is also back from a conference in Moscow. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs recognizes the Estonian police as a partner in cooperation and has agreed again to sell arms [as heard] to our police. But the main issue—who owns OMON [special purpose militia detachment] and at whose command does it act—still remains without an answer. Here is Olav Laanjarv:

[Laanjarv] We did not get an unambiguous answer because both Latvian and Lithuanian OMONs are on the payroll of the Vilnius division of the USSR Internal Troops, but Colonel General Shatalin, chief of the Internal Troops, announced in a kind of a nervous way that well, they get, get arms and equipment only as part of an arrangement but in practice—operationally even—they are not subordinated. That is, nobody wants to claim responsibility in this respect.

I handed over photographs of the attack at Ikla [border post] to the USSR minister of internal affairs. The response was unambiguous: according to (Goncharenko), representative of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in Riga, the Riga OMON has not been in Estonia.

[Saarna] And yet Minister Laanjarv emphasized that all possible border incidents must be resolved without bloodletting because it seems that the other side would like just that: Then they would have reason to come and create order. [passage omitted]

A resolution on wages was adopted today. Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar:

[Savisaar] A resolution has been adopted on carrying out a wage reform. It was decided to carry it out in three stages: from 1 July for the government apparatus and the courts system; second, for teachers, that is, for educational workers and for cultural workers as from 1 September; and for workers in health care as from 1 October. With all these three stages it will in essence mean that the wages will double, if one looks at the average, [words indistinct]. This will cost us about 250 million rubles. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Estonian Approach to Citizenship Deplored

PM2106160591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Igor Teterin "Polemical Comments:" "Citizenship: Who Has Freedom of Choice?"]

[Excerpt] Tallinn—[passage omitted] As already announced in the press, USSR and Estonian delegations began to have regular meetings recently. A whole complex of problems is to be examined by the sides. But here is a typical detail. The leading political force in the republic—today this is the Estonian People's Front [EPF]—immediately responded to the start of dialogue with an official message to the delegations. In it the EPF said that it "categorically opposes dual citizenship." Members of the EPF believe: "Every adult and person permanently residing in Estonia should choose citizenship of the Estonian Republic or the USSR in accordance with these countries' laws on citizenship."

But why? Why so categorical? Especially since Estonia still has no law on citizenship. What is more, the practice of dual citizenship is extremely widespread throughout the civilized world. For instance, if you leave Europe to live in the United States and become a U.S. citizen after some time, there is no reason for you to renounce your previous citizenship. Take the example of Israel, which considers Jews worldwide to be its citizens. It is by no means coincidence that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says in black and white: "No one can be arbitrarily deprived of their citizenship or the right to change their citizenship."

But some of our republics seem to take a different view of this problem. The citizenship problem is so provincial and purely pragmatic for the politicians who find themselves in power today.

Life is far more complex than political plans and presents us with a host of highly unpredictable situations. It is well known that thousands of ethnic Estonians live in various countries of the world today. I am by no means ruling out the possibility that some of them will want to return home. But, if we follow the local legal approaches to the letter, only those who give up their former Swedish, Canadian, Australian, or U.S. citizenship can become citizens of the sovereign Estonian republic. I am afraid that even Estonians abroad will not be drawn to their former homeland by these strange regulations regarding citizenship.

In other words, it is somehow awkward even to repeat the regular formula: The world is increasingly becoming integrated today, the fate of people in various countries is closely interwoven, and the distance between continents is shrinking to the time you spend in an airliner. And the problem of citizenship is also acquiring a very real everyday aspect here, too.

After all, you have to possess the relevant document—the passport of a state with diplomatic and consular relations with other countries—in order to travel freely around the wide world. The USSR has these links. There are Soviet consulates in most countries of the world. Incidentally, many Estonian politicians today travel in comfort around the world with Soviet diplomatic passports, which give them, as you may realize, a number of significant privileges. Whose citizens do they consider themselves to be today as they present their hammer and sickle?

But that is by the by. If we are not to deviate from the main subject of our argument, the main thing is that the future nonetheless looks confused for many residents of republics that have embarked on the road of "nonalignment." I remember for some reason being asked the following question recently in a Moscow home when we were discussing with friends the situation in the Baltics:

"What citizenship will you take?"

Instead of answering all I could do was gesture helplessly. I think that many people living in the Baltics, Georgia, and Moldova feel roughly the same way today. Why? I personally have nothing against Estonian citizenship, especially since I have lived here for several decades. Incidentally, I am impressed by the fact that people in the republic have of late begun to talk quite loudly and seriously about the problems of the nonindigenous population's integration into the life of the future sovereign republic. Even such political forces as the EPF now harbor no illusions over the possibility of a mass eastward exodus on the part of the non-Estonian-speaking population. On the contrary, the foundations of a policy of national accord are being elaborated.

But can even this policy be considered fully realistic if acquisition of Estonian citizenship is still obstinately made directly dependent on whether a person renounces his former citizenship or not? In this case, USSR citizenship.

It is considered a legal axiom in civilized countries that citizenship is accorded to a person by birth. But this by no means rules out the idea that they may in later life become the citizen of the country where fate has cast them. That is, they may have dual citizenship.

I am convinced that people should not be deprived of their right to be citizens of the country where they were born or of the right to acquire the citizenship of the country in which they are living. People themselves should have freedom to choose and this freedom should not be dependent on the political situation.

Sooner or later everyone—even the most radical politicians—will realize this. But until this understanding dawns, we will have to witness a host of absurd and improbable situations like those I described at the beginning of the article. It is sad, of course, but a fact. Particularly when the following words are shouted after us: "What a country, what will happen to them next?!"

Latvian Minister Comments on Moscow Talks

LD2406154891 Riga Radio Riga International Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Alois Vaznis, minister of internal affairs of the Republic of Latvia, has been discussing the actions of the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] in Latvia with the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and with Minister Pugo. The latter had asserted that the attacks were not inspired by the center, namely, by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, but in general the OMON matter should of course be solved by political means.

However, for the time being there was no signal from Moscow on the possible withdrawal of the special militia units from the republic.

Minister Alois Vaznis assesses his visit to Moscow:

[Begin recording] [Vaznis] The main idea why this meeting was convened and the principal issue was the collapse of the USSR united system of internal affairs.

The leadership of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is very concerned about how to preserve this system in the future. All of the discussion were about this, as were the questions which we, the ministers of internal affairs of the republics, spoke about.

I spoke, too. I expressed all of our complaints to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs—about the OMON, about the behavior of the Internal Troops, and about the behavior of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs with regard to disinformation and with regard to undermining the republic's authority, and so on. We had a talk there about all of these questions. This talk, of course, produced no results because the USSR minister of internal affairs, Pugo, is not inclined to do anything in connection with the OMON here in the republic. He bases himself on the premise that a certain part of the republic's inhabitants support the OMON. This is the principal thesis on which he relies.

[Unidentified correspondent] As I understand it, those OMON units will remain in Latvia, but for how long should we suffer their frequent arbitrariness?

[Vaznis] This question is, of course, very complicated. it is a political, military, and juridical question. Nothing can be rushed: It must be very seriously considered here, what to do and how to do it, and this we must do collectively in order that we also share collective responsibility for our actions. [end recording]

Latvian Law on Language Issued

LD2406203891 Riga Radio Riga International Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Text] This week the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia continued its accustomed legislative work. The adoption of the law on education of the Republic of Latvia in the third reading and the confirmation of the resolution on this law coming into force must be regarded as the most important decision.

In accordance with the law on education of the Republic of Latvia, in the future all inhabitants of Latvia are guaranteed the right to obtain secondary education in their native language, especially in the state language of Latvia.

An article of the law on the language of instruction lays down that mastering the state language is compulsory at all educational establishments under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Latvia. In turn, at the educational establishments financed by the state, the basic language will be the Latvian language. Students who lack adequate language knowledge on entering higher education establishments will have a guaranteed opportunity of improving them in the course of the first academic year.

The Communist minority faction of the Supreme Council has announced that such an education law of the Republic of Latvia is a transgression against human rights and denies Russian young people higher education in the republic.

The head of the Supreme Council's Commission for Education, Peteris Lakis, has said that no country in the world is able to insure delivery of lectures in the native languages of all the inhabitants of that country, and the inability to master one foreign language is rather to be regarded as an intellectual deficiency.

Latvian Production Slump Reported

PM2506085991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Down an Up Staircase?"]

[Text] Riga—A marked production slump now characterizes the state of Latvian industry. Specialists explain this by the shortage of raw material and other material resources.

The situation is indeed extremely complex: The level of production has declined at over half of all Latvia's industrial enterprises. According to the calculations of the republican committee for statistics during this time the enterprises of all cities except one—Rezekne—have failed to fulfill contract commitments for deliveries of output. In this connection some Latvian newspapers are writing of the possible collapse of the republic's industry while, it is true, so far putting a question mark at the end of the headlines in question.

Landsbergis Meets With French Leaders

OW2106040491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis is to meet with French leaders today in the course of his trip to a number of European countries which began yesterday.

V. Landsbergis met today with French Prime Minister Edith Cresson and Chairman of the Senate Alain Posche.

Later today V. Landsbergis is scheduled to meet Chairman of the French National Assembly Lorand Fabius.

At 17:00 the head of the Lithuanian parliament will be received by the French President Francois Mitterand. After that he will leave for Lyon to meet representatives of firms cooperating with Lithuanian enterprises on June 21.

On June 22 V. Landsbergis will go to Norway to attend the opening ceremony of the Lithuanian music festival in the town of Tundsberg. The National symphonic orchestra of Lithuania takes part in the festival.

On June 23 he will visit the German city of Kiel to meet deputies of Landstag, representatives of political parties and parliamentarians of the North European countries. On the same day he will go to hamburg and after that to Paris.

On June 24 V. Landsbergis plans to visit Toulouse.

On June 25 he will arrive in Strasburg to attend a Europarliament meeting. Later on that day he will fly to the French city of Nates to meet with Chairman of the French parliamentary association for the Baltic states Mr. Fouriet.

On June 26 V. Landsbergis will return to Paris where he is expected to meet with Mayor of Paris Jacques Chirac and to give a press conference on results of his visit to France. In the evening the Lithuanian leader will leave for Helsinki to take part in a meeting of parliamentarians from the USSR and the Baltic republics organized by the Europarliament representatives scheduled for June 27.

Lithuanian Prime Minister on Economic Reform

LD2106183791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Our most important task now is to solve internal problems, stated Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius, speaking yesterday on Lithuanian television. He stressed that the fate of Lithunia now depends on the prtactical implementation of political and economic changes. Therefore, internal affairs are now the focus of government attention. Nevertheless, we have no right to sever our links with the Soviet Union or the West, said Gediminas Vagnorius.

The Lithuanian prime minister noted that the government program is a program of reforms. The principal task of the government is to implement economic reform. The reform essentially started only last spring: Therefore, it is too early to expect to have a good life and demand that we do normal shopping and have normal wages. We must do everything in our power so that the crisis does not develop further during the reform. Therefore, the first step should be a pay increase and a consequent price rise. In case we do not carry out the economic reform, the Lithuanian market will become totally vulnerable to the ups and downs of the Soviet economy, stated Gedimanas Vagnorius, stressing that it is essential to implement the government program as soon as possible.

The government leader stated that a temporary measure essential during the transition to a market economy is goods coupons to be introduced in July. They should help to acquire goods in short supply. The government has decided to inroduce these coupons, stated the prime minister during an interview on Lithuanian radio today, because the present political situation makes it impossible to introduce our own monetary system, and because the ruble system is unsuitable for trade and we cannot find means of how to supply people with goods.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Meets Finnish President Koivisto 25 Jun

Direct Cooperation Discussed

LD2506111391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1020 GMT 25 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Jun (TASS)—A meeting between Boris Yeltsin, the chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, and Mauno Koivisto, the president of Finland, took place today in the Russian Federation's House of Soviets.

This is the first time that the head of the Russian parliament has met with the president of Finland. During the talk, the important guest congratulated Boris Yeltsin on being elected to the post of president of Russia.

Mauno Koivisto emphasized that his visit is an expression of the neighborly relations between the USSR and Finland. He showed an interest in the processes which are going on in the Soviet Union. At the request of the Finnish president, Boris Yeltsin acquainted him with the political and socioeconomic situation in the Russian Federation.

Today's meeting Discussed transition to direct cooperation between the Russian Federation and Finland, the head of the Russian parliament informed Soviet and foreign journalists after the talks came to an end.

Boris Yeltsin emphasized that "agreement was reached between the two sides on setting up a working group composed of representatives from the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which is to visit Finland in the near future to specifically discuss a program for such direct links."

Meeting Generates 'Great' Interest

LD2506094691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Text] [Announcer] Let's go over to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. Our accredited parliamentary correspondent there is Vladimir Perfilyev. You are on air, Volodya, we are listening to you.

[Perfilyev] Good morning.

[Announcer] Good morning.

[Perfilyev] The Russian parliamentarians are working in committees and commissions this morning, but before I tell you what they are doing, I will tell our listeners that I have just returned from the meeting that took place here in the House of Soviets on the Krasnopresnenskaya embankment....

[Announcer interrupts] In the White House, as it is now called.

[Perfilyev] Yes, in the White House. A meeting between Boris Yeltsin, the Russian president, and Mauno Koivisto, the president of the Republic of Finland. President Koivisto congratulated Boris Nikolayevich on his election to the high state post and expressed his satisfaction with the way neighborly relations are developing between our countries. He also expressed the wish that such relations will also come into being with Russia and our other republics.

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin agreed that economic and cultural links between Russia and Finland should develop further. He informed President Koivisto in detail about the reforms being carried out in the republic and about the way relations between the republics and the center are taking shape.

I must say that journalists from all branches of the media—written, spoken, and visual—have demonstrated a great deal of interest in this meeting, and all of them will carry news of this meeting very soon.

Now a few words about what is happening at the Supreme Soviet. I will remind you that the parliamentarians are working in committees and commissions. The majority of them are examining the draft Union treaty, a very important draft law. Besides this, the committee on issues of the development of culture, languages, ethnic traditions, and the preservation of historical heritage, for example, is examining the issue of putting the final touches on the RSFSR draft law on languages of the peoples of the RSFSR, which is also a very important issue. The commission for social policy is working on the draft law on indexation of the population's wages and the list of those to benefit from the law on state pensions. The committee for ecological issues is examining observations on the draft state ecological program for Russia and articles from the Russian ecological fund. There are many such issues, but I will not list them all. They are all very important in the sense that when the deputies gather for a joint session, all of these issues will be easier to resolve when they they have already been prepared. That is the end of my report.

Yeltsin Signs Free Economic Zone Directive

PM2406141591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by unnamed correspondent: "Free 'Amber'"]

[Text] Kaliningrad, 20 Jun—One more step has been taken toward the creation of a free economic zone in Kaliningrad Oblast. It has become known that B. Yeltsin has signed a directive on the economic and legal status of such a zone, named the "Amber" zone. It does not include all Kaliningrad Oblast—it excludes the rayons connected with the country's defense capability. Now the provision on the free economic zone must be approved. It is planned that it will lend impetus to the rapid development of the region and this should be promoted by joint ventures, a simplified procedure for export and import operations, and preferential tax and duty regimes.

Leningrad's Sobchak Challenges Media Appointment

LD2406193791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1845 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Report by TASS correspondents Lyudmila Fomicheva and Anna Shcherbakova]

[Text] Leningrad, 24 June (TASS)—Leonid Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company, who arrived in Leningrad today, told local radio and TV staff that Boris Petrov, who for several years has headed the Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, has been appointed deputy chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company and the director of Lenteleradio. This decree by the USSR president defined the hitherto not entirely clear status of the Leningrad Broadcast media.

Many local observers have regarded the appointment of Boris Petrov as turning Leningrad TV into a subsidiary of Central TV. Lately, television broadcasts from Leningrad, received in the expansive northwest region of the USSR, have distinguished themselves by their tone of political "opposition."

The city's mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak, who appeared on TV the same day said that the president's decision "does not take into account the views of Leningrad Soviet deputies and citizens, and may provoke confrontation with the center. For this reason, we categorically disagree with it," he said.

The question of setting up an independent or joint-stock television and radio company has repeatedly provoked intense discussions at sessions of the Leningrad Soviet. The city and oblast soviets of people's deputies and an association of industrial enterprises of Leningrad were willing to act as its co-founders. No decision, however, was actually made.

Confirming the structural incorporation of Leningrad Radio and TV into All-Union Radio and TV, the central leadership is undertaking to renew the material and technical base of the studios and to increase the pay of the staff.

To Discuss Food Issues

LD2406194491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak urgently flew to Moscow today. His brief visit to the capital, before the session of the Leningrad Soviet session which opens tomorrow, is connected with the recent resolution of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers according to which Leningrad will in 1992 cease to be supplied from the all-Union

food and agricultural raw materials stockpile. Several Leningrad Soviet deputies view the Cabinet of Ministers resolution as nothing other than a response to the victory for the democrats on 12 June. Sobchak is bringing with him to Moscow a proposal to the Russian Government to abolish this resolution and switch the supplies to Leningrad onto a basis of contracts between sovereign republics.

Popov Proposes Moscow Administrative Changes

LD2406220291 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhansky]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—Newly elected Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov on Monday proposed a new administrative and territorial division of the city.

He calls for reforming the city's executive structures and reorganising the existing 33 city districts into ten administrative areas and 123 municipal councils.

The areas are expected to fulfil a considerable portion of the city administration's duties, while the municipal councils will handle the city's economic and social issues.

An experiment to set up administrative areas in Moscow's Brateyevo and Krylatskoye districts has been successful so far, new chairman of Moscow City Council Nikolay Gonchar told TASS.

Popov and Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak have appealed to the Russian parliament presidium to make the mayors of these two cities accountable only to the Russian president. The decision was prompted by the "need to form a real mechanism for separating powers in Moscow and Leningrad".

This appeal, however, might as well have been motivated by recent complications between Moscow and Leningrad municipal councils with Popov and Sobchak.

Since the proposal entails changes in city administrative structures, the Russian parliament presidium has decided to consider the issue after Moscow and Leningrad city councils discuss it.

Moscow City Administrative Reforms Cited

LD2406185991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network 1600 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] (Bakirov), (Belykh), and Sedykh-Bondarenko, the deputy chairmen of the Moscow City Soviet elected on Friday, were today confirmed in their posts at a plenary sitting of the session. But the main event was the mayor's instructions published today on the reform of the city's administrative bodies. A city duma is to be set up in Moscow to coordinate the activity of administrative structures, as well as a city assembly—a government of Moscow as successor to the Moscow City Executive Committee, a mayor's department, and an administration of affairs. Deputies of the Moscow City Soviet sent an address to the Moscow administration requesting that it officially provide the Moscow Soviet with its proposals on the structure of the city's administration. The debate on the matter of the privatization of housing in the city has been postponed until 27 June.

Chechen-Ingush Republic Congress Opens 21 Jun

LD2206024191 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 21 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sharip Asuyev]

[Text] Grozniy June 21 TASS—The first congress of peoples of the Chechen-Ingush Republic opened here today.

Some 800 delegates, representing over 80 peoples and nationalities living in this north Caucasian republic in the Russian Federation, and guests from many regions in the Soviet Union are attending the two-day congress.

They aim to search for ways to uproot negative trends that have manifested themselves in interethnic relations recently, and to ensure unity, peace and accord among all citizens of the Republic, irrespective of their nationality, number and beliefs.

Stalin abolished the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic in February 1944, and it was restored by Khrushchev 13 years later. This May, the republican parliament has constitutionally fixed the Republic's sovereignty and removed the words "Autonomous Soviet Socialist" from its name.

In a greeting sent to participants in the congress, President Mikhail Gorbachev expressed confidence that friendship and cooperation between representatives from over 100 nationalities living in the Republic, will help resolve acute problems facing the Republic and the whole country during radical changes and reforms.

Gorbachev Addresses Delegates

PM2406122991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[Message from M. Gorbachev "To First Congress of Peoples of Checheno-Ingushetia"]

[Text] Dear Comrades! I cordially greet the multinational people of Checheno-Ingushetia representatives who have gathered for their first congress to discuss urgent problems of their life. I am sure that your forum will find the correct paths for the republic's development.

The Chechen and Ingush peoples are known in the country for their industry, hospitality, openness, and generous feelings. Despite the hard times they are experiencing they have been able to safeguard their culture and best national traditions.

Today, when the law on the rehabilitation of repressed peoples has been adopted, I share with you, friends, a feeling of satisfaction. I am sure that friendship and cooperation between representatives of over 100 nationalities living in the republic will promote the solution of the complex problems which face you and the entire country in the present stormy time of radical reforms and transformations.

I cannot fail to note the political stability maintained in Checheno-Ingushetia. The conservation of a normal rhythm in the republic's economic and political life is important not only for its peoples but also as a good example of the development of interethnic relations in the North Caucasus.

I wish your congress success and all citizens of Checheno-Ingushetia peace and prosperity.

[signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.

Congress Ends

LD2206220191 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 22 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sharip Asuyev]

[Text] Grozniy June 22 TASS—The first congress of peoples of the Chechen-Ingush autonomous republic, which ended here today, called for the unity, peace and accord of people of all nationalities.

The two-day congress, attended by representatives of about all of 100 nationalities inhabiting the republic, stated in a special resolution that against the background of tragic developments in some regions of the country, a normal climate of interethnic relations and a stable socio-political situation are being maintained in the Chechen-Ingush republic thanks to the wisdom and restraint of all nations living there.

This does not mean, however, that there are no acute and burning problems in the republic.

The criminal deportation of all Chechens and Ingushes during the repressions of the Stalin regime, that lasted 13 years, made a strong impact on the social, economic and cultural situation in the area.

Its consequences are just beginning to be eliminated. Naturally, national revival processes are developing with some difficulties. Attempts are being made to make them even more complicated and start interethnic tension.

The congress strongly denounced those attempts of some extremist-minded individuals. In their address to President Gorbachev, delegates to the congress assured him that the multinational Chechen-Ingush republic would always make a perceptible contribution to fraternal cooperation of free nations, to peace and accord in society.

The congress adopted an appeal to Russian President Boris Yeltsin and suggested to all peoples inhabiting the Northern Caucasus that a congress of their representatives be held in Grozniy.

Deputies Alarmed at Moves Against Gorbachev

PM2406150191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by parliamentary observer Andrey Zhdankin: "Parliament Alarmed"]

[Text] Members of the republic [Supreme] Soviet have expressed their extreme alarm at the situation that has formed behind the Kremlin walls, and in particular at the Union parliament sittings. In President Gorbachev's absence, Prime Minister Pavlov demanded additional powers for himself, and the obliging Union parliament was almost prepared to grant them to him. Leaders of military-political departments Pugo, Kryuchkov, and Yazov expressed their support for these demands. The country, particularly the Russian deputies, do not know what they reported, as the sittings took place behind closed doors. Many are assessing this as an attempt at a "cabinet coup d'etat."

The Russian deputies demanded a joint sitting with a report on the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings from R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian parliament.

Ruslan Imranovich spoke briefly. "The latest speeches made by a number of deputies at the USSR Supreme Soviet give us pause. An attempt was made to cast doubt on the legality of the Novo-Ogarevo agreements and the statement of the "Ten." Now that the outlines of the Union treaty have taken shape quite clearly, certain Union deputies are expressing doubts about its necessity. The address made by Prime Minister Pavlov, who wants additional powers to circumvent the president, also makes us wonder. And the prime minster is finding support among the forces opposed to the Union treaty. The latest measures taken by the prime minister are provoking the same reaction, thus placing the Customs Committee in a complex position. The same applies to the demand made by the Peasants' Union to introduce a state of emergency.

Many deputies are stressing that the state of affairs is reminiscent—even in the details—of the situation last fall when the process of stabilization of the country's political life was completely disrupted when conservative forces torpedoed the 500 days program. The situation became almost critical.

The Russian parliament did not manage to obtain any information about what was said at the closed sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet anyway.

Nor did the parliamentarians manage to decide what was to happen about the appeal to the peoples of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and to

Union republic supreme soviets which had been prepared. First they voted to complete it and adopt it right away afterward. But this proposal did not win the required number of votes. The proposal made by Deputy L. Gurevich, who put forward the idea of voting right away for the adoption of the appeal as a basis, was not supported either.

The deputies paid tribute to those who died in the Great Patriotic War.

After the recess, the chambers worked separately again.

Siberian Communists Criticize Soviet Leadership

LD2406225291 Moscow TASS in English 2207 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Trofimov]

[Text] Ulan-Ude June 25 TASS—Leaders of eleven major Soviet Communist Party organisations in Siberia have lashed out at the Soviet leadership in the Buryat press, accusing it of revising of the 28th CPSU Congress' decisions.

The appeal "to members of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee" by party organisations from Buryatia, Tuva, Altai, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, Kemerovo, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Tomsk, Tyumen and Chita regions noted that "recent actions by the country's political and state leadership are increasingly anti-popular".

The appeal says "there are signs of retreat from the 28th CPSU Congress' decisions" and that "a small group of people guide the party and the state, ignoring the Soviet Constitution and Soviet laws. They have betrayed perestroyka's goals set in 1985".

The appeal calls for an immediate plenary meeting of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee to discuss the political situation in the country, as well as for an extraordinary congress of Russian Communists to adopt a programme and a charter of the Russian Communist Party.

Siberian Secretaries Urge Congress of Communists

LD2406220391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] The first secretaries of Siberian party organizations have published a statement in which they accuse the country's leadership of actions against the people and demand an extraordinary congress of communists.

Tatarstan To Independently Sign Union Treaty

OW2506043791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Mintimer Shaymiyev of Tatarstan has told a news conference in Kazan that his republic intends to sign the new Union Treaty independently, and conclude a treaty with the Russian Federation thereafter. The text of the draft worked out at Novo-Ogarevo, which, according to Mr. Shaymiyev, contains a number of significant corrections, will be discussed by the Supreme Soviet of Tatarstan at its session opening on July 4.

The Tatar president described the Novo-Ogarevo meeting as "difficult", since many ex-autonomous republics objected to the suggested (smaller than the present) quotas of representation in national government bodies.

RSFSR Diplomats To Be Posted in Soviet Embassies

OW2506075791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By Igor Porshnev, diplomatic correspondent; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "The Russian Federation intends to ensure the representation of its interests in the United States," the deputy foreign minister of the republic, Andrey Fedorov, has told the Dilomatic Panorama correspondent. He said the optimum solution would be to have Russian diplomats on the staff of the USSR Embassy, rather than to set up any kind of separate misssion. This is the general principle of the Russian Government as regards its relations with all foreign countries. The Russian Government has already come to a general understanding with the USSR Foreign Ministry about it, Fedorov said. Russian diplomats will soon appear in the USSR embassies in Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China, India, and several other countries.

Fedorov said he approved of the fact that some Soviet embassies had charged some of their staff with maintaining contacts with various Union republics. But he emphasised that this work could not be entirely successful unless those who did it were well informed of what was going on in the republics. Thus every republic should, he believes, have its own diplomats abroad.

A high-ranking Western diplomat has said in Moscow in connection with Boris Yeltsin's recent visit to the United States that the U.S. Administration would like to have contacts with all Union republics, including Russia. As for Russia's possible diplomatic representation in Washington, this, he believes, above all comes within the competence of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Silayev Views Denationalization, Privatization

LD2206100291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1349 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Excerpts] Today Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, visited the bus plant in the town of Golitsyno. Correspondent Andrey Veduta reports:

[Veduta] [passage omitted] The interest shown by Russia's prime minister in this plant is no coincidence because the Russian Government will own 40 percent of its share property; and the transfer of the Golitsyno plant to share property is in accord with the program of denationalization and privatization drawn up by the Russian Government. I asked Ivan Stepanovich Silayev to talk about this in more detail.

[Begin recording] [Silayev] It is not just a plant that is integrated with a Western firm that is being created here but also a new form of economic function, a joint-stock company. That is even more important for us, that is what is primary. Therefore, from the example of the problems and the questions that arise while setting up [word indistinct] we wish to check our approaches and actions in implementing a very important section of our program: denationalization and privatization. You know that we are beginning a program of supporting businesss activity and entrepreneurship, the very basis of economic prosperity, and then, as an essential condition, granting autonomy to all forms of economic entities to solve for themselves their basic problems and to dispose of the output they produce.

Therefore, our visit here is just a working episode in the implementation of the second phase of the program.

[Veduta] In the Russian Government program the preferred option is share property?

[Silayev] Yes, world experience shows that today the most efficient way for specific citizens to hold property in labor collectives is the share form. And here there is no need for us to invent anything. It is only important for us to support this, and not only by laws. Laws are needed but so is the relevant support in the form of providing credits and in the form of some kinds of benefits. [end recording]

Licensing of RSFSR Commodity Exchanges Begins

PM2506125791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Jun 91 p 1

[Sergey Nikitin report: "Don't Count on 'Luck.' Licensing of Russian Commodity Exchanges Has Begun"]

[Text] A commodity exchange is not just a place where trade deals are concluded. In any developed state this organization guarantees that neither the purchaser nor the vendor will be ripped off in the process. Legislative acts tightly regulate the exchange control rules. But now around 100 future "blood vessels" of the Russian economy have managed to spring up and even start trading before the relevant republic resolutions have been adopted.

At the end of last week this enforced jumping of the gun began to enter normal channels. A commission under the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Antimonopoly Policy and Support for New Economic Structures started to issuing licenses to engage in exchange activity. And for this a whole bundle of documents meeting a series of previously stipulated requirements had to be presented for judgment by experts.

The first to risk their fortune were the Ufa Commodity and Stock Exchange and Khabarovsk and Baykal Commodity Exchanges. Impartial analysis, however, showed that the candidates were in many respects relying on "luck." Members of the Licensing Commission critically studied the applications and spotted lots of shortcomings in them. The representative from Bashkiria headed for home emptyhanded. And the Khabarovsk and Baykal exchanges were issued with licenses on condition that all necessary amendments are made to the documents. Otherwise permission will be suspended.

After the official part of the commission's first sitting ended, the discussion turned to the importance of maintaining a high reputation for the Russian exchanges. The debate's outcome can be summarized in these words: Nobody will be able to compromise our brokers unless they do this themselves.

"Gentlemen," Mr. Aleksey Vlasov, cochairman of the RTSB [expansion unknown] Exchange Council, addressed those present, "gentlemen, it is a matter of honor! Unless we want to be discredited, all the requirements of the statute on licensing must be fulfilled."

Well, that is excellently put. And since in the next three months all Russian exchanges will have to pass this procedure, we provide the Moscow telephone number on which interested persons can obtain information on the licensing procedure: 430-86-99.

Western Republics

Belorussia Votes For Republican President

LD2406152991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] [Announcer] The Belorussian Supreme Soviet has voted in favor of the introduction of the post of president of the republic by a majority vote. Leonid Sviridov, the NEWS SERVICE correspondent in Minsk has contacted our studio:

[Sviridov] Hello?

[Announcer] Yes, we can hear you Leonid.

[Sviridov] The arguments for and against during the debate were highly diverse and ranged right up to the comments of deputy Vladimir Gorkun, a former party functionary, to the effect that, I quote: The election of a president is also needed to level relations with Russia and Kazakhstan, end quote. Well, it is a weighty argument and highly Bolshevik—to level and maybe even overtake. And so there is going to be a Belorussian president. The Communist wanted to drag through a proposal for the first president to be elected directly at

the session but, surprisingly and fortunately, this did not gain the required number of votes.

The Belorussian president will be elected by popular vote, but as for the election procedure, or who can nominate candidates for this top post, and finally the date of the elections—all of this will probably be determined within the next few days. But in the meantime, the possible candidates are being discussed in the corridors of the session. It is highly likely that Belorussia's own Makashov, Bakatin, and Tuleyev will merge. Incidentally, the Belorussian version of Mr. Zhirinovskiy is also appearing.

I would like to name whom I regard as the two most realistic candidates, namely Vyachelsav Kebich, the Belorussian prime minister, and Stanislav Shushkevich, first deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. Over the past few weeks Vyacheslav Kebich has been rapidly accumulating points, especially following his sharply negative assessment of the decision of Pavlov's cabinet published on 17 June. Kebich said that this decision amounts to executing the republic's economy by firing squad. Strong words, aren't they? More importantly, they are essentially correct. And yet, I am not going to rush into further forecasts. We, too, will wait and see who will become a candidate for Belorussian president. This is Russia's RADIO NEWS SERVICE. Leonid Sviridov in Minsk.

Ukraine's Kravchuk Discusses Union Treaty

LD2406212991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0835 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Kiev, 24 June [TASS]—UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya: "We ought to build the new union as a union of sovereign states. All clauses, all articles of the Union treaty should be permeated with this conceptual idea," Leonid Kravchuk, head of the parliament of the Ukraine, stated when addressing deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine.

Speaking on his participation in the work of the preparatory committee on completing the work on the draft Union treaty, Leonid Kravchuk noted that on the whole the committee coped with its tasks. It is now up to the peoples' deputies of the republic. "We should elaborate the draft treaty in an attentive, comprehensive, and profound way. It would be advisable to discuss it beforehand at a sitting of the presidium and in the standing commissions and then to present it to the plenary sitting of the Supreme Soviet," he stated. In the opinion of Leonid Kravchuk, it will scarcely be possible to reach a consensus on all the clauses of the treaty.

"The principles of the declaration of the state sovereignty of the Ukraine are law for us, and we must base ourselves on them in deciding the question of unification with other republics into a union of sovereign states," the chairman of the Supreme Soviet stressed. In the opinion of Leonid Kravchuk, the Ukraine can preserve its state sovereignty as part of the new union. "The present integration processes, as world practice shows, are a demand of the time and are natural. And we should not be on the sidelines. At the same time, the republic also should have such political structures of its own which would avert encroachments upon our state sovereignty."

Speaking of the procedure for the possible withdrawal of the republics from the Union, Leonid Kravchuk said that a new mechanism for leaving the new union should be developed.

Moscow Television Reports Kiev Rukh Rally

LD2406212191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Rukh Ukrainian people's movement of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian republican parties have held a rally in Kiev. In their speeches the leaders of the party claimed that signing the new Union treaty will deprive the Ukraine of its independence, dooming it to being a colony in the future.

[Reporter V. Lyashkov] The Rukh branch is holding a meeting in the square by the Lvov opera theater, in connection with next week's debate in the Ukrainian parliament on the new Union treaty and the possibility of signing it. The organizers of the rally believe that without having received its statehood the ukraine has no right to enter a treaty with other sovereign republics. I would like to add that the results of the Union referendum in Lvov, Ivano-Frankovsk, and Chernobyl Oblasts showed that about 90 percent of the electorate spoke in favour of creating here a great independent united [sobornyy] Ukrainian power. [video shows rally scenes]

Rally Denounces Union Treaty

LD2406211391 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 23 Jun 91

[Excerpt] A multi-thousand meeting was held in Kiev today under the slogan: "No to the Union treaty." Correspondent Oleh Bedzyk reports.

[Begin recording] [Bedzyk] The meeting was convened by the efforts of the Ukrainian Republican Party [URP], Rukh, and Narodna Rada, which acts as the official opposition in the parliament.

As is known, the republic's Supreme Soviet will soon deal with the Union treaty. As can be seen, today's meeting shows once again that the attitude to the future pact is not unified. A great number of Kievites and guests of the city gathered on the site outside the republican stadium. All of them have turned out to be staunch and patient people because when a downpour literally drowned the site, everyone remained standing and

waiting. The meeting was opened by Levko Lukyanenko, chairman of the URP and a Ukraine people's deputy. He said:

[Lukyanenko] Esteemed Kievites, esteemed guests from all the Ukraine and from other regions, we are living in an outstanding epoch. For the first time under the communist occupation of Ukraine that has lasted for 73 years, we are able to express our thoughts in the parliament as spokesman of the Narodna Rada and also listen to the thoughts of people that gather as we have done today. We see in this unity a great force, a guarantee that the democratic forces which are gaining in strength with every new day will be able to win the final victory—to build our independent self-standing Ukraine.

Today, Ukraine is overcast with black clouds once again—there is the danger that it may sign the Union treaty. Hence we, the representatives of the Narodna Rada and also of the democratic parties, decided to turn to you for help and hold this meeting and devote it to the greatest of the themes. This theme is: No to the Union treaty! [applause]

[Bedzyk] As is known, many people's deputies, including those of the Narodna Rada, did not oppose the idea of creating a union of sovereign states. However, the latest version of the treaty, as proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, has aroused categorical denial in the meeting's participants. Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, one of the Rukh leaders, said in his speech:

[Yavorivskyy] I hold in my hands the text of the latest variant of the treaty. It is signed by Gorbachev. He is very nervous and keeps demanding from the republics that they discuss, approve and sign it already in June!

The first sentence in this document is thus: The union of Soviet sovereign republics consists of sovereign states. The next sentence is this: The union of Soviet sovereign republics is a sovereign state. There is no need to read the text any further. All I can say is that regardless of the novel, cosmetically improved phraseology, the treaty is worse than the preceding one. The treaty will grab everything from us: International politics will be controlled by the center, wholly and solely; the same will apply to external economic relations. And what would be most dreadful for Ukraine—the center will also control nuclear engineering. The Ukraine has never, probably, experienced such a dramatic moment as today. It is the people who must say the final word. I want to tell you with all responsibility that those 140 democrats elected by you to the Supreme Soviet will not be able to change anything. Only your pressure on the parliament, only the pressure of the millions of people on the parliament may prevent yet another signing of the shameful treaty. If Ukraine puts its signature under the treaty, it will be thrown back for decades and even centuries.

[Bedzyk] Next to speak was Ivan Drach, chairman of Rukh.

[Drach] If we fail to instill the sovereignty of Ukraine with substantial organic strength, I mean with our own customs services, with our own currency, with our own army, we will not have our own statehood. All this we must achieve only by democratic means.

[Bedzyk] Ihor Yukhnovskyy, chairman of the Narodna Rada in the parliament, underlined the following:

[Yukhnovskyy] A commonwealth of independent states (?is being replaced) by the Union. The Union as a state is impossible. Our first demand to the Supreme Soviet is this: Declare the independence of Ukraine. [applause] Second, fulfill the decisions passed in connection with the demands of students and striking workers. Third, no to the Union treaty until Ukraine acquires the status of a fully independent state and adopts a new constitution.

[Bedzyk] Speakers from other parties also opposed the signing of the Union treaty. A representative of the Odessa city council made a similar call to Jewish communities. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Ukraine Strike Committee Holds Founding Congress

LD2206185791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1330 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Text] The founding congress of the All-Ukrainian Association of Strike Committees has opened in Kiev. Summing up the results of the spring strikes, it was stated that the main result of the strikes that took place is the fact that the miners initiated interbranch, interregional solidarity of the workers in the Ukraine. The task of the founding congress is to create a union of workers and to achieve coordination of action in the further struggle for the sovereignty of the Ukraine and for the political, economic, and social rights of the workers.

Youth Paper Profiles Ukrainian Nationalists

PM2406143591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 pp 1, 2

[Article by S. Romanyuk: "Who Is This Bolshevik Climbing Onto the Armored Car Again?"]

[Text] Lvov—He was taken away from the Ukrainian Republican Party Congress to the resuscitation department of a Kiev hospital. The diagnosis was inexorable: myocardial infarction. Coming around, he confides to his wife: His former ally Stepan Khmara, who chaired the congress, is to blame for this occurrence. It was he who rudely interrupted him in mid-sentence.

We are talking about Vyacheslav Chornovil, the nonparty chairman of Lvov Oblast Soviet, who attended the republicans' assembly as a guest.

Humiliation, slander, physical violence—the poet Vasiliy Stus, who died in prison, described how Chornovil was driven out barefoot in temperatures of 30 degrees below freezing—he endured all that and returned home full of joie de vivre. He would tell me in

an interview that this was entirely thanks to his wife, who, in true Decembrist style, waited for him for one-and-a-half decades. As if borne on wings, he easily and spontaneously rose to power; ten out of ten voted for him in what was his most awkward district, and the deputies almost unanimously elected him oblast soviet chairman.

When, on the authorization of a majority of the parliamentarians, Stepan Khmara was arrested in the hall of the Supreme Soviet, Chornovil, alone among the deputies, expressed a public protest and walked out of the conference hall, not returning until Khmara was freed.

And a week before the heart attack Chornovil stated in yet another interview:

"Today tendencies are emerging toward replacing one Bolshevism with another. Although we revere the struggle for national liberation in the western Ukraine, to revive the 'Bandera-ist' organization or the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists today would be absurd."

But he has begun to give ground generally in recent months. You can sense that the burden of power and of unresolved problems is crushing him with its overwhelming weight. The Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee] is pointedly ignoring the power of the soviets. An unexpected blow has ensued from the nationalists. Only a year ago the apparently monolithic national movement in the Western Ukraine split into two.... And it turned out that the nationalists hate the national democrats, who nowadays have an overwhelming majority in the soviets, just as much as they do the Communists.

Chornovil, the brothers Goryn, Levko Lukyanenko—former political prisoners—the leaders of Rukh, headed by the poets Drach and Pavlychko, and the representatives of the new Ukrainian parties not belonging to the interparty assembly have found themselves in between two barricades: On the one hand, the Communists are "coming out of the trenches," on the other, the nationalists are rising.

Last summer Oleg Vitovich, a deputy of the oblast soviet, attended a fairly calm Lvov rally and pointlessly made a statement about Ukrainians being superior to other people "twice or 10 times over," and with this slogan he embarked on a tour of the republic. When the prosecutor's office in a neighboring oblast appealed to the Lvov Soviet for permission to inaugurate proceedings against Vitovich, Vyacheslav Chornovil replied: "Words must be fought with words; that is perfectly democratic."

But Vitovich, that nice young man, was just beginning his campaign.

While head of the Independent Ukrainian Youth League, he caused the league to split and then was expelled from it altogether. It was an interesting time! Vladimir Yavorivskiy was "invited" from the Ukrainian Republican Party. Also unable to fulfill themselves in this political situation were the extreme radicals: Yuriy Shukhevich (son of Roman Shukhevich, former commander in chief of the Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army), Grigoriy Prikhodko, Vasyl Varladyanu (an admirer of the Ukrainian monarchy), Vasyl Sychko, and others. Power ebbed away from them, and only Stepan Khmara managed to hitch himself to the last wagon and found himself in the republic parliament. But he did not especially make his mark there, apart from recommending himself, in Chornovil's opinion, as a vehement, "neolithic" anticommunist, for which a criminal charge was, in my view, transparently trumped up against him.

The political failures awaited their revenge. They needed a leader. Thus the former stomatologist Khmara, one of those who, in the words of Chornovil again, "once tried unsuccessfully to join the Communist Party or to make a service career under the Communists," became the banner of the revanchist forces.

By the end of last year the need for them to register formally as an organization had emerged, and so was born the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly, which absorbed small groups and parties preaching integral nationalism. This term does not exist in Soviet historiography, so I use foreign sources./Professor Ivan Lysyach-Rudnitskiy [name as transliterated] of the Canadian University of Edmonton calls integral nationalism a "totalitarian world view."

Indeed, the leaders of the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly themselves have stated many times that their organization is an alternative structure to democracies of any kind. In a press conference Yuriy Shukhevich named the movement's slogan as "Ukraine for the Ukrainians." Not forgetting to specify at the same time: including the "the lands of Voronezh Oblast that have been Ukrainian since time immemorial."

Oleg Vitovich is even more unfettered in his pronouncements. He is exercised by the idea of "building a world-dominating Ukrainian state" and intends to "give the Ukraine an era of world domination."

The Ukrainian Interparty Assembly's goals are propagated by the theoretical journal NAPRYAM [trend], edited by Vladimir Yavorivskiy, and a number of other publications. These ideas often appear on the pages of more moderate papers. In April, for instance, ZA VILNU UKRAINU [For A Free Ukraine] invited the leaders of parties and movements supporting the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly, together with representatives of Rukh, to a roundtable and published a detailed, full-page report. The nationalists went on the offensive, while their opponents only expressed some disagreement. Extremely bizarre views were not infrequently expressed. Oblast Soviet Deputy Mykol Drak stated:

"We began with a peaceful, bloodless struggle.... At a certain stage we may be compelled to wage it by other methods."

A decipherment of "other methods" soon followed. This time from another deputy, Miroslav Glubish, chairman of Drogobych City Soviet:

"If there are no weapons, there will be no democracy. And I believe that, even today, if it comes to war with the bloody commune—whether in Lithuania, Georgia, or Azerbaijan—our young people will rally to those flags, just to destroy the bloody Communist regime. That is what will happen.... The times are not so long past when insurrectionist bullets cut down the Bolshevik swine. When the need arises, they will do the same again. There will be no mercy."

These words were spoken at the end of May at a rally dedicated to the opening of a memorial to the soldiers of the SS "Galichina" division.

The memorial is good. A 10-meter stela crowned with a basalt cross soars aloft from Mount Zhbyr and is visible throughout the district. Rumors about the construction had been going around for a long time, but the original idea had been different. "Pamyat" [memorial association] proposed to immortalize the memory of all who fell in World War II, irrespective of their nationality or the flag under which they fought.... After all, there are neither enemies nor traitors among the dead, and they have redeemed all their guilt or innocence before mankind with their own lives.

"Pamyat," entering into consultations with the local authorities, deferred the project until better times. The idea was picked up and altered by the student fraternity. On the very eve of the opening of the stela, Vyacheslav Chornovil attempted to restore its original status, but it was already too late. You cannot just rub the SS symbols off the monument, and the words spoken by Glubish are being circulated in dozens of newspapers.

A great tragedy took place here near the Zhbyr heights in 1944. According to some reports, the Ukrainian division put up by the fascists against the attacking Red Army lost more than 5,000 men. And in the neighboring villages throughout Galicia live the relatives of the dead, for whom each of the fallen is somebody's father, husband, or grandfather. Each of the fallen is worthy of people's remembrance. Each of the fallen individually, undoubtedly; but is the idea which brought these 5,000 soldiers, and many millions more soldiers, and people who were not soldiers at all—Ukrainians and Germans, Russians and Italians, Belorussians and Letts—to the most terrible fate on earth, a violent death, worth commemorating?

We should remember well the aims of the SS, and not make ourselves believe in their false nobility.

The "Divisioners"—this term has established itself in Ukrainian emigre historiography—were not sworn to fidelity to the Ukraine, as some people here are trying to make out. They were sworn to Hitler. Here is an extract from the oath of allegiance: "To faithfully serve Adolf Hitler, as the great Fuehrer of the new Europe." All commands were issued in German, and soldiers wore the ordinary SS uniform. In his book **History of the Ukrainian Army** [Istoriya Ukrainskogo Voyska], published in Canada, the Ukrainian military figure M. Kapustyanskiy wrote: "The command of the regiments... and almost all the divisions was in German hands. In addition the chief advisers [referenty] to the Cossack units were surrounded by German senior officers...."

The international tribunal in Nuremberg condemned the SS as a criminal organization. When a few years ago the U.S. president laid a wreath at a German military cemetery, where SS officers lie alongside soldiers of the Wehrmacht, this caused an international scandal. Professor Bogdan Osadchuk wrote in the spring of this year: "For some time now reports have been circulating here (in Germany—S.R.) about the inclinations of western Ukrainian youth to revive the ideas of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the doctrines of Dmitriy Dontsov, who for the local liberal, Christian Democratic and Social Democratic communities is a representative of fascist ideology.... Recent news about monuments being set up to Bandera have done great damage to our interests in the eyes of German democrats...."

In Germany they really know what fascism is.

But today Dontsov is the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly's ideological leader. In the opinion of researchers his main work, entitled "Nationalism," is except for a few chapters very like a translation from Hitler's book "Mein Kampf." But a hint about this only had to be dropped to a leader of the republic parliament for the journal NAPRYAM to explode with an angry article. The journal transparently hinted that if there had indeed been a scissors-and-paste job, it was not Dontsov who copied Hitler's ideas but vice versa, since "Nationalism" came out in 1929, whereas the second volume of "Mein Kampf" was published only in the following year. Now there's a pathetic kind of primacy.

Dontsov is being reprinted in Lvov and a subscription has been launched for his works.

When you read some of the works of the modern theoreticians of unified socialism, you cannot help thinking: Hasn't this been dredged from the "Short Course?" Totalitarian thinking, whether it is painted in class or in national colors, is antihuman by its very nature. The platform of one of the ultra-right parties in the Ukrainian National Union says that, for a nation, "the individual is only an element" (let us recall the Stalinist "cogs"). Oles Vitovich claims: "For members of a national organization the essence of all life is encoded in the formula 'Everything in the nation and nothing outside it....' Things which other people live for—their family, their money, their house, and so forth—are for them a senseless waste of time." Oleg Babiy, another member of the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly, is convinced that the Ukraine's enemy has always been not just the state apparatus of Peter I, Kerenskiy, and Vladimir Lenin but the Russian nation itself.

Vitovich has worked out a well-put-together concept of the national organization which, in his opinion, is leading the Ukraine "to the summit of Golgotha." It is a kind of "nationalist order." Vitovich compares it with the Society of Jesus, and nationalism with medieval Christianity. In this sense the nation, in comparison with the individual, represents the higher morality, and therefore everything which is in its interests is justified!

Yes, we have seen this already—Auschwitz, Buchenwald....

Evidently history teaches that it teaches nothing.... I sometimes close my eyes and recall stories heard in childhood. Even long years after the war my fellow villagers feared more than anything else the nighttime knock at the door. Intruders in the forest used to knock in that way, and appear on the doorstep with the single phrase:

"Come with me."

And if a bloody torch was raised to the night sky, people knew that the answer there had been "No."

Caucasus

Armenia's Manukyan Raises Confidence Question

LD2406171891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1036 GMT 24 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 14 June. (TASS)—Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, raised the question of confidence in himself as head of government at a sitting of the session of the republic's supreme soviet today. The prime minister stated in particular that of late he and his government have been coming under attack because of the republic's political crisis. Manukyan noted that the government which he has led since last August has managed to stop the destruction of Armenia's economy.

Raising the confidence issue, the head of government called for solidarity and unity among the republic's political forces and for unity around the ideas contained in the independence declaration and the referendum planned for 21 September on Armenia's withdrawal from the USSR. Referring to discussion by the Armenian Supreme Soviet of proposals by the constitutional commission to expand significantly the functions of the presidium of the republic's supreme soviet and bring the chairman of the Council of Ministers into the presidium, Manukyan spoke out sharply against merging legislative and executive power. In the opinion of the head of government, rather than strengthening executive power in the current situation in the republic, the functions of the new structures of power will be eroded.

If the parliament does confirm its confidence in the chairman of the Council of Ministers, stated Manukyan, he will no longer submit "to dictate from functionaries belonging to any party," but will be guided only by the republic's curent laws and by decisions of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, stated that there can only be a vote of confidence in the cabinet after the report by the chairman of the Council of Ministers on his activities over the last 10 months. Manukyan noted that he will deliver his report only after the report by the chairman of the republic's supreme soviet.

After a short debate, a break was announced at the session during which political fractions and groups will hold consultations.

Early Referendum Urged

OW2406112591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 22 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The leader of the radical opposition group "Armenia's National Self-Determination", Mr. Paruir Ayrikyan, told a rally in Yerevan on Friday that "either the Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan or the Prime Minister Vazgen Manukyan must resign, since the policy they pursue is fatal to the Armenian people".

Mr. Ayriyan suggested holding a referendum on Armenian independence not on September 21, as the republic's parliament has decided, but earlier—possibly, in July. He said "a referendum in September will be useless; it will only mark yet another blind attempt to obey the Center's instructions."

According to P. Ayrikyan, the republic's parliament "should be protected from the open pressure" if the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, and Chairman Ter-Petrosyan in person. As evidence of it he cited the bill giving the Presidium extraordinary powers, which is now under discussion in parliament. Mr. Ayrikyan described the bill as "another graphic instance of totalitarianism and infringement of the democratic freedoms in Armenia modest as they are."

Armenian Supreme Soviet Acts on Presidium

NC2006123291 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Report by Mavr Danielyan and Mesrop Saakyan from the 19 June Armenian Supreme Soviet session, in Yerevan]

[Excerpts] [Danielyan] Yesterday's heated debates and disagreements continued in today's Armenian Supreme Soviet full session. The parliament continued the debate on reforming the Supreme Soviet Presidium and on increasing its responsibilities.

As previously reported, a bill on this matter was submitted to a vote on 18 June and failed to obtain a majority. At this morning's session, chairperson Gagik Arutyunyan, Supreme Soviet deputy chairman, announced that the representatives informed him that they did not oppose the entire bill, only sections of it. They suggested that some of the points be modified and the bill be resubmitted.

However, a new vote again failed to get the required number of votes. After some deputies and the chairman clarified some points, the bill was resubmitted to another vote with the following amendment: To temporarily increase the Supreme Soviet Presidium's authority until a new republican constitution is adopted, barring a Supreme Soviet decision in the interim.

Some 140 deputies voted for the bill and it was endorsed for further debate. Our colleague Mesrop Saakyan interviewed People's Deputy Granush Akobyan on the bill

[Saakyan] Mrs. Akobyan what is your view on President Levon Ter-Petrosyan's speech yesterday and the bill endorsed today?

[Begin Akobyan recording] [passage omitted] I believe President Ter-Petrosyan's summed up the mistakes and shortcomings in the government and power structure and those mechanisms which do not function and, in effect, prevent the establishment of law and order in the republic. Today, there is no clear supervisory mechanism through which the Supreme Soviet can supervise its commissions, the Presidium, the council of ministers, or the ministries. The lack of such a mechanism is the reason for the examination of this bill.

Why do we need radical reforms? Today there were many calls for the Presidium to resign. I categorically reject such calls because the Presidium acts within the limits set by the Constitution. The Constitution denies the Presidium many executive functions and has given it purely organizational functions. They are merely acting within the framework of these organizational functions. As a member of the former Presidium, I can state that we resolved problems relating to economic, political and social life of the republic, whereas now the Presidium has no such powers. If we carefully examine the bylaws of the standing commissions we will see that far more authority has been given to them at the expense of the Presidium. We, as a body of 200 to 250 persons, are not in a position to speedily examine operative matters at the parliament; such issues should be handed over to the Presidium because we are unwittingly digressing into prattling while economic laws are neglected. We need laws to lay the foundations for a law-based state; today we do not have these laws. For the last 10 months we have only managed to adopt basic laws on land ownership and the multi-party system, whereas the rest of the laws have been neglected.

I cannot understand this fierce parliamentary activity on this document. After all, Point 6 states that the parliament could veto, nullify, revise, or abolish any Presidium decision. There is therefore no fear that by giving further functions to this Presidium we might end up giving it far more powers then needed. [end recording]

[Danielyan] The session then voted to form a new Supreme Soviet Presidium. [passage omitted]

[Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian at 1215 GMT on 19 June reports that the passage of the bill is necessary "to enable the Armenian Supreme Soviet to act with far more flexibility in view of the unstable economic and political situation in the USSR and Armenia."]

Armenian President on Secession From USSR

TA2306111291 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 23 Jun 91 p A10

["Exclusive" report from Armenia by Yo'av Qarni]

[Excerpt] Yerevan—The small republic of Armenia, south of the Caucasus, is determined to secede from the Soviet Union. But, its president says, "Mikhail Gorbachev will do everything in his power to obstruct our independence."

Interviewed by HA'ARETZ, Armenia's President Levon Ter-Petrosyan said that last month Armenians were expelled from 23 villages along the disputed border between his country and the neighboring republic of Azerbaijan. The dispute between the two republics is clearly of an ethnic and religious nature, since the Azeris are Turkish-speaking Muslims while the Armenians are Christians.

President Ter-Petrosyan believes that fear about the reaction of democrats in the Soviet Union and of international public opinion will ultimately curb Gorbachev. In his opinion, Boris Yeltsin's landslide victory in the presidential elections in the Russian Federation "is almost undoubtedly the final victory of the democratic forces in the Soviet Union."

Nevertheless, Ter-Petrosyan has no intention whatsoever of changing his position to the effect that Armenia will not take part in any contacts concerning a new union treaty in the Soviet Union. In three months his government plans to hold a referendum about independence, as required by the Soviet Constitution. If there is a majority in favor of independence, as all the observers and politicians whom I interviewed during my week-long visit in Armenia seem to believe, the government will begin the five-year-long secession process. [passage omitted]

Armenian Communists Favor Union Treaty

LD2106191391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 21 Jun 91

[Text] Armenian communists favor a Union treaty. Sarkisyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, stated the following at a news conference in Yerevan: There is no political party or other organization in Armenia at present that is able, on its own, to extricate the republic from an economic crisis. Sarkisyan reminded the audience that communists of the republic proposed, together with other political forces, to elaborate an all-nation anticrisis program and to create a coalition government. The leader of the Armenian communists thinks that nobody can give the parliament and the government of the republic the right to make statements with respect to participating or not participating in a Union treaty before a referendum on the future status of Armenia is held, which is planned for 21 September.

Central Asia

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev on Union Treaty Issues

LD2406181191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1152 GMT 24 Jun 91

By correspondent Tatyana Zhurbenko

[Text] Alma-Ata, 24 June (TASS)—President Nursultan Nazarbayev addressed a session of the Supreme Soviet of Kazakhstan today and acquainted members of parliament with the position of several of those involved in working on the draft union treaty. As we all know, the basic provisions of this document were agreed by a preparatory committee and sent for discussion by the parliaments of the country and of the republic. While considering this version of the draft to be most democratic and holding that it secures quite fully the right of nations to self-determination Nursultan Nazarbayev nonetheless presented several proposals regarding some articles in it for deputies to discuss.

In particular it is the president's opinion that there must be a more precise definition of the concept of parties to the treaty. Only republics which directly make up the union—and there are currently nine of them—should be parties to it, while republics which form part of these union republics should sign the treaty as part of the delegation from these republics.

There is also a need to be more precise about further representation in the new structure of the supreme body of state power—the Soviet of the Republics and the Soviet of the Union—and also about the number of delegates from autonomous and national territorial areas.

There are also objections, noted the president, over the concept of "joint ownership" in the republics, for example, who will be in charge of the fuel balance, the energy base, and railway communications which run throughout the country. In Nazarbayev's opinion all this must be governed by inter-republican bodies.

Special attention was paid to shaping the country's budget. While supporting in principle the idea of a federal tax, the republic cannot agree with the machinery for collecting it, the president said. The tax system proposed by the country's Cabinet of Ministers would lead to the virtual impoverishment of the already sparse capacities of the republic.

After discussing the proposals of the president of Kazakhstan, the deputies adopted a decision which on the whole approved the draft union treaty. A plenipotentiary delegation headed by Nursultan Nazarbayev was set up. When work on the draft has finally been completed it will represent the interests of Kazakhstan.

Kazakhstan Parliament Discusses Union Treaty

OW2506033891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Monday, the parliament in Kazakhstan discussed the draft Treaty of Union, and heard President Nursultan Nazarbayev report on the subject.

The president described the draft as a document "unprecedented in government development." He said "the fact that the treaty was written by the republics making up the new Union, and not by the Center, can be expected to be a major instrument in stabilizing the political and economic situation."

Discussing the most controversial provisions of the new treaty, Mr. Nazarbayev suggested that the term "participant in the treaty" receive a clearer interpretation and be applied "only to the republics planning to form the future Union, with the delegations of the autonomous republics having to sign the treaty as subdivisions of the delegations of their respective union republics."

The Kazakh president censured the suggested principle of forming the Supreme Soviet's Council of the Republics and Council of the Union. In his view, the Council of the Republics should offer all the subjects of the new federation equal representation quotas, and have precedence over the Union Council.

Uzbek President Congratulates Yeltsin

LD2506075991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Jun 91

[Text] Uzbek President Islam Karimov has sent telegram to Boris Yeltsin congratulating him on his election as president. He wished Boris Nikolayevich good health, happiness, and success in his new crucial post. Karimov expressed confidence that tradional friendship and close cooperation between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Uzbek peoples will continue to develop, becoming ever stronger for the benefit of our multi-ethnic homeland.